Advocate of Peace.

VOL. LXVII. BOSTON, APRIL, 1905. No. 4

THE AMERICAN PEACE SOCIETY,
PUBLISHERS,
31 BEACON STREET, BOSTON, MASS.

MONTHLY, ONE DOLLAR PER YEAR. TEN CENTS PER COPY

Entered at the Boston Post Office as Second Class Matter.

CONTENTS.

PAGE

EDITORIALS 69-74

The President on Our Relations to Other Nations — The Greatest Battle in History, The Greatest Dishonor — Hon. John D. Long on Increase of the Navy — Rumors of Peace — The Christ of the Andes — Annual Meeting of the American Peace Society.

EDITORIAL NOTES 74-77

"Let us Have Peace" — Kuropatkin's Disgrace — Canadian Peace Society — New York Women's Peace Circle — South Carolina's Voice for Peace — The Bloch Foundation — International Institute of Agriculture — Arbitration Group in Congress.

BREVITIES 77-78

GENERAL ARTICLES:

Brave Brothers, Fight no More. *Poem. Julia Harris May*.... 79
Efforts to Bring About Mediation Between Russia and Japan .. 79-80
International Arbitration at the Opening of the Twentieth Century. *Benjamin F. Trueblood* 80-85
Women and War. *Grace Isabel Colbron*..... 85-86
One Other Neutral Water Way. *J. W. Leeds* 86-87
What the United States Should Do to Promote a General Treaty of Obligatory Arbitration at the Next Hague Conference..... 87
A Business Man's View of the Senate's Action on the Arbitration Treaties. *A. B. Farquhar* 87-88
Some Suitable Inscriptions for the Gateways of Forts, Arsenals and for Battle Flags. *Mary S. Robinson* 88-89

The President on Our Relations to Other Nations.

In his inaugural address on the 4th of March, President Roosevelt gave utterance again in a succinct way to his well-known views in regard to our national relations to other countries. The following passage covers essentially the whole range of his thought on this subject:

"Toward all other nations, large and small, our attitude must be one of cordial and sincere friendship. We must show not only in our words but in our deeds that we are earnestly desirous of securing their goodwill by acting toward them in a spirit of just and generous recognition of all their rights. But justice and generosity, as in an individual, count most when shown not by the weak but by the strong. While ever careful to refrain from wronging others, we must be no less insistent that we are not wronged ourselves. We wish peace; but we wish the peace of justice, the peace of righteousness. We wish it because we think it is right, and not because we are afraid. No weak nation that acts rightly and justly should ever have cause to fear us, and no strong power should ever be able to single us out as a subject for insolent aggression."

The sentiments expressed in the first two sentences of the above citation are entirely sound and noble. The truth about our moral obligations toward other nations could not well be better phrased in the same number of words. In his message to Congress in December, and more particularly in his address at the unveiling of the statue of Frederick the Great, the President gave utterance in a much ampler way to the same ideas. Nothing could be finer than the passage in the latter address in which he unfolded our national duties to Germany and other foreign countries.

We have not the least doubt that Mr. Roosevelt is perfectly sincere in these excellent utterances. But it is to be regretted that he did not leave the counterpart in the above paragraph, and in similar paragraphs in the other cases, unspoken. He weakens by these supplementary sentences, where his thought becomes discordant, the whole force of his previous assertions, and lays them open to suspicion of insincerity and pretense. He could not have chosen a worse support for his position than that of justice and generosity in individuals. Here physical strength and weakness have nothing to do with the effectiveness of these qualities. Justice and generosity in individuals count for what they are in themselves, not by reason of the height or the avoirdupois of the person, the facility with which he can punch, or the quantity of small artillery which he carries in his hip pockets. One of the glories of our common life is that exhibitions of justice and generosity by physically weak persons often win the highest mead of praise and confidence, and are most effective in influence, because they are known to be the pure stuff. The suggestion that behind your just and generous conduct you have a reserve of muscle and fist, or of pistol and powder, with which to drive it home, if necessary, is not conducive to confidence in the purity of your professions.

Again, well bred people in private life are not always trumpeting it about that they will not allow themselves to be wronged. The greatest and most influential men are those who, doing right themselves, pay least heed to the petty insults and wrongs which befall them, but bear them patiently without seeking satisfaction and revenge. The peace which these men seek is something greater than "the peace of justice," of enforced justice, that is; it is the peace which self-control, magnanimity, self-sacrifice, unstinted beneficence, patient endurance of wrong, create and enforce by their very nature. This is

now in large measure the law of life in all our Christian communities. It ought to be given at least a trial or two in international life before it is declared to be impracticable there.

The President's frequent use of the words injustice, "insolent aggression," and the like, in regard to possible malignant purposes of foreign powers towards us is most unfortunate. He wishes "cordial and sincere friendship" to exist between us and all other nations; but dark hints of a spirit of insolent aggression in them is the best possible means of preventing them from feeling cordial friendliness towards us. If we expect other nations to trust us and believe in our assertions of disinterested regard for them, we must trust them in a generous way. That is the immutable law of friendship. If we openly charge them, however indirectly and hypothetically, with hostile feelings against us, who can blame them for feeling that we are very unfair and essentially hostile toward them, notwithstanding all our high pretentions of "acting" toward them in a spirit of just and generous recognition of all their rights?

The Greatest Battle in History — The Greatest Dishonor.

Certain editors and correspondents, and a good many other people, too, have been entertaining themselves since the beginning of the recent gigantic battle at Moukden with calculations to show that it has been the greatest battle ever fought in human history.

Most of these calculations have revealed no sense of anguish at the direfulness of the stupendous duel, every move in which has been attended with the wholesale slaughter and mangling of thousands of men and the desolation of innumerable far-away homes. A certain keen intellectual relish seems to have been taken by these people in the atrocious conflict, as if the soldiers who have been shooting and bayoneting one another, and suffering and dying in frightful masses, had been nothing more than lifeless pieces on an immense chessboard, or wooden pins at the end of some huge bowling alley. The big battle with its hundred miles of fighting men has been spoken of as if it had been a fine and noble event, worthy to be recorded alongside the truly great occurrences of the world's history. Its very bigness seems, in the minds of many, to have clothed it with extraordinary excellence and attractiveness, and to have covered up its inherent ghastliness and shame.

It is hard to understand this cold and heartless attitude of mind in people calling themselves civilized, people trained in our schools and in our churches, who are thoroughly tender and humane in common life, people who are driven to the verge of nervous wreck by the death and ruin caused by a boiler explosion like that, for instance, which recently destroyed a hundred people in Brockton, Mass. These same people can, many of them, read with positive pleasure the accounts of the great butcheries of men about Moukden. The multiplication of the horrible explosion by thousands on every hillside, in every gorge and glen, where the big shrieking shells tumble in every minute with their deliverances of hell, transforms for them the whole business; it turns darkness into light; and, like ignorant children who see nothing back of the flaming spectacle, they shout: "Splendid! Magnificent! Glorious!"

What is the cause? The false ideas of war which have so long ruled the world, and perverted both men's judgment and their moral sense. If only men could tear themselves loose from these old conceptions, from the tyrannous power of a crude and senseless public sentiment and have the courage to look at things as they are, in the light of their own reason, there would not be left a man on the earth to say a single word in condonement of the ghastly tragedy in Manchuria.

This has indeed been the greatest battle in history. It has thrown more men into deadly array against one another than any other recorded engagement. It has cost more in life and treasure. It has been the fullest of horrible *mêlés*. But for this very reason it has been the greatest dishonor in the annals of man. The excuses which might be offered for the ancient barbarities cannot be made for it. It has taken place at the opening of this twentieth century, not in the days of the Huns and Visigoths. It has been a murderous deed of midnight executed openly at high noon. It shames every civilized man of us in every Christian country that such a thing has been possible at this late day. We are as guilty in our way as the perpetrators themselves. We have taught them or encouraged them in the cultivation of the arts of death. The great battle is therefore the world's sin and shame.

There are of course many people who have from the beginning felt the iniquity and dishonor of the conflict. The number of these increases daily as the war drags its bloody length over the hills and across the plains of Manchuria. The cry for peace, a final peace for the world too, is becoming louder and stronger day by day. Even war men are joining the ranks of those who demand peace. This gigantic struggle is too much for them. They like war — in the abstract. It is their profession. They can stand a fair amount of the butchery of men; a few "bloody angles" and ditches filled with dead and dying men do not greatly disturb their composure. But this "awful slaughter of human beings" in Manchuria is carrying the thing a little too far. It reaches the inmost depths of their natures, where conscience and humane feeling, still alive in spite of their profession, rise up in revolt against the awful business. Lord

Charles Beresford of the British navy, one of this class of men, said the other day in Pittsburg:

"The whole world is opposed to the outrageous conflicts that have been brought about in this war. It is shameful to think of the awful slaughter of human beings, and even should the hostile countries show any inclination to continue the fight, it will be but a question of time until other powers will interfere to prevent any further loss of life in such an atrocious fashion as has characterized all the battles in this fight. As a matter of fact, it seems altogether probable that this will prove the last of the big wars. Nearly all of the bigger countries seem to favor the abolition of such hostilities, and it will be only a matter of time until all international difficulties are adjusted in some other way than by going to war."

That is the lesson which this biggest battle in history, this greatest dishonor of humanity, is impressing upon men. If Lord Beresford only had the courage to go to the end of his logic, he would not stop with the "big wars." He would say "all wars" must go, and he would hasten their going by going out of the business himself. The only way in which big wars differ from little ones is that there is more of them. But it is more of the same kind. The shamefulness is in the war itself, not in the size of it.

Neither of the nations whose immense armies have fought and bled about Moukden have laid up for themselves any honor thereby. The time is not remote when all men, in Russia and Japan as well as elsewhere, will look back upon the shameful scene with utter amazement that it could ever have been.

Hon. John D. Long on Increase of the Navy.

Any utterance of Hon. John D. Long upon the matter of the navy naturally attracts and deserves attention, as he recently occupied the position of Secretary of the Navy for a considerable period and has otherwise had wide experience in public affairs.

In an article entitled "Shall the Navy be Increased?" which appeared in the *Independent* for March 23, Mr. Long expresses himself as opposed to any present enlargement of the navy, and thus takes a position in direct opposition to the views held by President Roosevelt. He gives several reasons for his contention.

He believes that "there is always danger that in strengthening our military armament . . . we may incur the temptation to use our increased force in an offensive direction." The Monroe Doctrine he thinks "we are pushing a little too far." By asserting this established doctrine of the country too radically "we may place ourselves in the position of interfering too far in the affairs and with the rights of other nations." He does not like the San Domingo treaty. The policy which dictated that treaty "is likely to lead not in the ways of peace, but to those complications arising from interference in the affairs of other nations and carrying the peril of the chance of war." Such a policy once entered upon would almost inevitably lead us to go beyond mere revenue collecting and disbursing for the settlement of debts, into the assumption of control of the general foreign relations of the state which we were trying to aid. This policy, he feels, "is certainly a departure from the well established Washingtonian policy of non-entanglement for our country which has stood till these later days."

Mr. Long states admirably the peculiar danger of having a big navy at a time when there is nothing for the ships to do except to drill and manœuvre. "There is a tendency to gather some of the small craft, including now and then a big one, at any point where the telegraph suggests that there has been a riot or an uprising or a threat of change of government in some of the countries south of us." Taking a hand is then a very easy thing for naval officers to do. The ex-Secretary of the Navy feels that in this regard we should be careful to cultivate "reserve and self-restraint" and "to be very sure that it is our own business which we are minding."

Because of the present strength of our navy, Mr. Long holds "that the recent system of appropriating every year for large numbers of new battleships is not wise and is going too far and too fast." He would have had Congress "refrain this year from appropriating for any battleship." The heavy expenditures which the government is making "for the navy in a time of peace, on the basis of a time of war, are a little out of keeping with our position as a peaceful nation. Too great a navy will be regarded not in the light of protection but of menace, and of temptation to involve ourselves in the affairs of other nations, and so to incur the danger of being drawn into their wars." It will inevitably awaken suspicion about us abroad.

All these observations of Mr. Long are, as far as they go, most just, and might have been stated much more positively than he has stated them.

It seems to us, however, that the support which he gives in this same article to the idea that our country ought to have a large navy, corresponding to our increasing national development, weakens very greatly the force of all that he says in opposition to present increase. Mr. Roosevelt would instantly claim that that is all he is asking for, measuring the national development, of course, by something more than the mere increase of population. One of Mr. Long's special reasons for refraining for the time being from further enlargement of the navy is because he fears that the people will become so alarmed thereby that the reaction will prevent what he calls the slower and healthier development of it. In other words, let us not have a big navy now, that we may be sure to have one in the long run! But

what difference does it make if we are to have a big navy, whether we get it before the people become frightened, as Mr. Roosevelt would do, or build it slowly, without scaring them, as Mr. Long desires?

The whole theory that our nation ought to increase its navy in proportion to its growth seems to us to be based upon entirely untenable premises. It assumes that the barbaric and unfriendly international relations of the past still continue, and are to continue for the future, that civilization is making no progress. It assumes that the sea is the same dangerous place for commerce that it was three-quarters of a century ago. It further assumes that certain foreign nations are constantly possessed of a malignant wish to humiliate us, to despoil us, and to beat us out of our proper sphere, and that they are more likely to do this now than in the days when we were small and relatively weak.

A little thought must convince any one that the exact opposites are true. Piracy has gone from the seas. Commerce is safe—if it behaves itself—almost absolutely safe, in every quarter of the world. The relations of the nations are improving and becoming more friendly with extraordinary rapidity. Civilization is relegating force more and more into the background everywhere in common life. There is not a particle of proof that any foreign government has any evil designs upon us or upon our proper sphere. If they had, the folly of crossing the seas thousands of miles to attack us in our impregnable position, with a population much greater than that of any other of the first-class powers except Russia, would appear to them so great as to keep them in their own ports.

The whole present state of civilization and our country's position and part in it argue strongly for a less rather than for a greater American navy. If we had the courage to stop where we are, or to lead in moderate reduction, the other governments would be inspired by the noble example, and either singly or jointly would quickly find some way of following it.

Rumors of Peace.

Rumors of negotiations with a view to end the war in the East have been unusually rife during the closing days of March. On the 30th came an announcement of information from "unimpeachable sources" that Russia and Japan had chosen President Roosevelt as mediator. The day before it was the French Foreign Minister, M. Delcassé, whom the Czar had charged with the duty of learning from the Mikado's government what peace terms would be acceptable. Connected with these announcements was the further one that the Russian advisory council of war had counseled the Czar that it was hopeless to continue the struggle.

All these rumors have been, as we go to press, categorically denied by both governments. The Russian government says that it has authorized no one to ask Japan for terms of peace. Baron Hayashi, Japanese Ambassador in London, declares that his country will enter upon no negotiations except directly with Russia, and that Japan is giving her attention to the military operations in Manchuria, and not to peace *pourparlers*.

The situation looks, therefore, as if the war were to go on indefinitely. The Japanese army is again in motion, following the retreating Russian forces northward toward Harbin. If General Linevitch finds himself sufficiently reinforced to make a stand, we may expect in a short time another deadly engagement, with a repetition of the awful holocausts of Moukden and Liaoyang. The hour and power of darkness are still to continue in that war-cursed region, no one knows how long.

It is not easy to determine what has been the basis of these strong, persistent peace rumors. They have been doubtless in part produced by the earnest efforts which are known to have been made by King Edward, Foreign Minister Delcassé, Secretary Hay and others, to induce the belligerents to accept mediation and to carry the sanguinary struggle no further. The general demand on the part of the civilized world for a cessation of the war has also operated to multiply and extend the rumors of peace negotiations. The press has been quick to respond to these influences, and the great dailies are each as eager now to report the first word of peace as they were in the beginning to sound the first note of war.

The civilized world wants the war to end, there is no doubt of that. It is tired and sick of reading of the atrocious butcheries of men, many of whom have been dragged unwillingly into the conflict, and whose lives have no value to the governments except as so many pieces in the fighting machine. It is outraged in conscience at the gross inhumanity and folly of the spectacle. But this outraged cry over the dreadful scene is for the present as powerless as a baby's clenched hand. War is war, and when it is once going it cannot be cried or wept or deplored to a standstill. It rages on according to its own law until it fights itself out, and at least one of the parties is beaten into helplessness, like a slugger collapsed and limp on the floor of the ring.

The time to arrest such a war as that now going on is before it commences. And that is the business to which civilized society should hereafter diligently give itself — to prevent any such scene from ever again disgracing the earth. It is a credit to men's hearts passionately to desire to put an end to such shocking deeds as those which for the past year have marked the Eastern conflict; it would be much more creditable to their heads if they put forth the same amount of spiritual energy in making such things impossible for the future.

The Christ of the Andes.

The first anniversary, March 13, just past, of the placing of the colossal statue of Christ on the Andean border between Chile and the Argentine Republic has recalled the unique and impressive events which led to the erection of this remarkable peace monument. The story has not yet become generally known in this country. We take the liberty, therefore, of rehearsing to our readers the salient features of it.

Five years ago these two prosperous and high-spirited republics of South America were on the verge of war. They were increasing their armaments to the utmost of their ability. They had each two gigantic warships of the latest pattern building in the shipyards of Europe. They were spending incredible sums of money upon these preparations for war, amounting, as was reported at the time, to five dollars annually per capita of their population.

What brought them so near to open conflict was the revival of an old dispute which had caused much bloodshed in the past, about the boundary between them on the Andes, a controversy involving the question of the title to about eighty thousand square miles of territory. The dispute had been rendered more acute by the discovery that in the Patagonian section the boundary was not continuously marked by mountain crests, and that there were valuable rivers in the region sending their waters through the hills to the sea on the Chilean side. This discovery had caused Chile to put forward unexpected claims to certain parts of the region.

The British ministers residing at Buenos Ayres and Santiago used their good offices with the two governments to prevent the calamity of war and to secure a peaceful settlement of the dispute. This effort to prevent hostilities was powerfully supported by Dr. Marcolino Benevente, Bishop of San Juan de Cuyo, Argentina, and Dr. Ramon Angel Jara, Bishop of San Carlos de Ancud, Chile. On Easter Sunday, 1900, during the festival of the Catholic Church at Buenos Ayres, Bishop Benevente made a fervent appeal in behalf of peace, and proposed that some day a statue of Christ should be placed on the Andean border between the two countries, where it might be seen by all comers and goers, and prevent, if possible, any recurrence of animosity and strife between the two republics. The two bishops traveled through their countries addressing crowds of men in the towns and villages. They were sustained by the local clergy and by the women, who labored enthusiastically for the policy of peace. Petitions were sent to the legislatures, and through these the executives were reached.

The result was that a treaty was entered into by the two governments, submitting the controversy to the arbitration of the King of England. He entrusted the case to eminent jurists and expert geographers, who examined it carefully, and in due time submitted their decision, awarding a part of the disputed territory to one of the republics and a part to the other. The decision was cheerfully accepted by both.

Much gratified with the outcome of the arbitration, and urged forward by a powerful popular movement, the two governments then went further, and in June, 1903, concluded a treaty by the terms of which they pledged themselves for a period of five years to submit all controversies arising between them to arbitration, the first general arbitration treaty ever concluded. In a further treaty they agreed to reduce their armies to the proportions of police forces, to stop the building of the great battleships then under construction, and to diminish the naval armaments which they already possessed.

The provisions of these treaties, which have now been in force nearly two years, were carried out as fast as practicable. The land forces have been reduced, the heavy ordnance taken off the war vessels, and several of the vessels of the marine turned over to the commercial fleets. Work on the four great warships was immediately arrested, and some of them have been sold. One or two of them, unfortunately, went into the Japanese fleet off Port Arthur, in spite of the fact that both governments had, in the treaty, pledged themselves not to sell any ships to nations engaged in war. The vessels were bought under disguise by a firm in New York, and then turned over to Japan; after which neither of the governments would sell any vessels to either Russia or Japan.

The results of this disarmament — for it is a real disarmament — have been most remarkable. With the money saved by the lessening of military and naval expenses, internal and coast improvements have been made. Good roads have been constructed. Chile has turned an arsenal into a school for manual training. She has also built a much needed breakwater in the harbor of Valparaiso, and commenced systematically the improvement of her commercial facilities along the coast. One or two of Argentina's previous war vessels have gone into her commercial fleet and are now plying back and forth across the Atlantic in honorable and lucrative business. Contracts have recently been let for the building of a railway through the heart of the Andes, which will bind Buenos Ayres and Santiago together in the most intimate relations of trade and travel.

But more significant than any of these material results has been the change in the attitude of the Argentines and Chileans toward each other. All the old bitterness and distrust have passed away, and the most cordial good feeling and confidence have taken their place.

The suggestion of Bishop Benevente as to the erection of a statue of Christ on the boundary at Puente del Inca was quickly carried into execution. As early as 1901, on the initiative of Señora de Costa, president of the Christian Mothers' Association of Buenos Ayres, one of the largest women's organizations in the world, the women of Buenos Ayres, who had already manifested the deepest interest in the new movement, undertook the task of securing funds and having a statue created. The work was entrusted to the young Argentine sculptor, Mateo Alonzo. When his design was accepted, the statue was cast at the arsenal of Buenos Ayres from old cannon taken from the ancient fortress outside of the city.

It was more than a year from the time that it was cast until it was placed in its destined position. In May, 1903, the Chilean representatives, bearing the treaties for final ratification, came by sea to Buenos Ayres. They were met down the river and escorted to the city by a large fleet of gaily decked steamers. For two weeks there was a round of festivities. While these were going on, Señora de Costa invited all the dignitaries present — cabinet officials, foreign ministers, newspaper men, bishops, generals, admirals, etc. — to inspect the statue of Christ in the courtyard of the college, and standing at its foot with the distinguished audience about her she pleaded that it might be placed on the highest accessible point of the Andes between the two countries.

It was not till in February, 1904, that the final steps were taken for its erection. It was carried by rail in huge crates from Buenos Ayres to Mendoza, then on gun carriages up the mountains, the soldiers and sailors themselves taking the ropes in critical places, where there was danger of the mules stumbling. Hundreds of persons had come up the night before and encamped on the ground to be present at the ceremony. The Argentines ranged themselves on the soil of Chile and the Chileans on the Argentine side. There was music and the booming of guns, whose echoes resounded through the mountains. The moment of unveiling, after the parts had been placed in position, was one of solemn silence. The statue was then dedicated to the whole world as a practical lesson of peace and goodwill. The ceremonies of the day, March 13, 1904, were closed, as the sun went down, with a prayer that love and kindness might penetrate the hearts of men everywhere.

The base of the statue is in granite. On this is a granite sphere, weighing some fourteen tons, on which the outlines of the world are sketched. The figure of Christ above, in bronze, is twenty-six feet in height. The cross supported in his left hand is five feet higher. The right hand is stretched out in blessing. On the granite base are two bronze tablets, one of them given by the Workingmen's Union of Buenos Ayres, the other by the Working Women. One of them gives the record of the creation and erection of the statue; on the other are inscribed the words:

"Sooner shall these mountains crumble into dust than Argentina and Chile break the vows to which they have pledged themselves at the feet of Christ."

It is not easy to compare events and say which is the greatest. But taking it all in all, the long quarrel of seventy years which it closed, the arbitration of the boundary dispute, the general treaty of arbitration and the practical disarmament which preceded it, the remarkable transformation of public opinion expressed in its consummation, and the sublime prophecy of peace for the future which it gives not only for Chile and Argentina but for the whole world, the erection of the Christ of the Andes stands without parallel among the events of recent years.

Annual Meeting of the American Peace Society.

The Seventy-seventh Annual Meeting of the American Peace Society will be held in Boston on the 18th day of May, the sixth anniversary of the opening of the Hague Conference in 1899. Announcement will be made in the next issue of the ADVOCATE OF PEACE, in the Boston press, and also by private notice to all members of the Society of the place and hours and character of the meetings and the names of the persons who will speak. In view of the remarkable progress of the movement during the year, as evidenced by the great Peace Congress at Boston, the Interparliamentary Conference at St. Louis, the numerous arbitration treaties signed, the large accession of new members to the Society, etc., it is expected that this will be one of the most important and influential annual meetings of the organization ever held. It is expected that steps will then be taken to greatly strengthen and widen the Society's work, the details of which will in due time be made known.

Editorial Notes.

"Let us have Peace."

The letter of General Grant in which his famous words, "Let us have peace," were first used, has been discovered. The *American Law Review* for January-February, 1905, page 106 says:

"The celebrated 'Let us have peace' letter of General Grant was unearthed the other day by some workmen in a cellar at Hartford. The letter was written by General Grant on military headquarters' paper, with the printed words scratched out. It was addressed to General

Hawley, who, it seems, as chairman of a committee of the Republican Convention of 1868, had notified him of his nomination for the Presidency. It did not contain more than one hundred and fifty words. The last paragraph, which contained the celebrated clause, was as follows:

"'Peace and universal prosperity, its sequence, with economy of administration, will lighten the burden of taxation, while it constantly reduces the national debt. Let us have peace.

'With great respect.

'(Signed) U. S. GRANT.'"

This famous utterance, it will be remembered, is the only inscription upon the Grant Monument overlooking the Hudson in the northern part of the city of New York. It has been quoted so often that it is nearly impossible to think of Grant's name without spontaneously recalling it.

Kuropatkin's Disgrace.

The removal of General Kuropatkin from the position of commander-in-chief of the Russian armies in the Far East because he failed to defeat the Japanese forces in the battle of Mukden, illustrates, as so many similar cases in the wars of the past have done, the inherent cruelty and depravity of war. According to the law of war, it was his duty to conquer. Having failed to do this, he was degraded from his position. No account was taken of the fact that, from the military point of view, he had probably done, under the circumstances, as well as any soldier in Russia could have done, and had thus earned the right to stay where he was. But all his toil and heroism, his saving as much of the Russian army as he did from destruction or capture by the greater and better equipped forces of the Japanese went for nothing. His military head was taken off because he did not accomplish the impossible. He was gazetted as "Disgraced," and another put into his place. In this respect, as in nearly all others, war reverses all the laws of right and justice which prevail among men in common life. It is itself a disgraced and dishonored system, and ought to be everywhere so gazetted.

Canadian Peace Society.

The Canadian Peace and Arbitration Society, the organization of which came about as a result of the series of meetings held at Toronto following the Boston Peace Congress in October last, has finally begun to get into good working order. The headquarters of the society is to be at Toronto. All citizens of Canada desirous of promoting peace may become members. Provision is made in the constitution for the establishment of Provincial branches, when desired, in different parts of the Dominion. The Executive Committee, provisionally, consists of seventeen well known men chosen from Toronto, Kingston, Brantford, Stratford, Guelph, Ottawa, Calgary, and Louisburg, C. B. Thirty-five prominent citizens of Canada, from Montreal, Toronto, Kingston, Halifax and other cities, have identified themselves with the movement, among whom are Bishop Bond of Montreal, Principal Gordon of Queen's University, Kingston, and several of the professors in the Toronto University. The purpose of the society is expressed in Article 2: "This society, being founded on the principle that war is contrary to true religion, sound morality and the best interests of humanity, shall have for its object the promotion of universal and permanent peace by means of arbitration and by cultivating the spirit of goodwill among men." The Secretary of the society, Dr. A. C. Courtice, 141 College Street, Toronto, has sent out for the society a circular letter asking for the coöperation of citizens of Canada in the work which the organization hopes to accomplish.

New York Women's Peace Circle.

Through the influence of Mrs. Lucia Ames Mead, who has been holding a most successful series of meetings in New York and Philadelphia, an organization of women of New York City interested in the cause of peace is being formed. The meeting at which steps were taken to effect the organization was held about the middle of last month at the home of Mrs. Arnold Schramm. Mrs. Schramm was elected president and Mrs. Henry Hastings first vice-president. The Circle is to be affiliated with the American Peace Society. The aim of the Circle, as expressed in the constitution, is "to show the inconsistency of war with the true spirit of civilization, to show the baleful influences of war on mankind and to insure means of establishing permanent peace." The Circle is to hold a public mass meeting the first Monday before Easter.

South Carolina's Voice for Peace.

Mr. John J. Dargan of Hartsville, S. C., was the only accredited delegate from the South to the Boston Peace Congress last October. Curiously enough he was the only delegate from any Association of teachers anywhere in the United States. He was sent to the Congress by the State Teachers' Association of South Carolina, and at their expense. Mr. Dargan recalled the interesting fact that on the very day (July 4, 1845) that Charles Sumner delivered his oration on "The True Grandeur of Nations" in Boston, James L. Petigru, probably the ablest lawyer that South Carolina ever produced, delivered an oration in Charleston on "The True Glory of America," in which

he emphasized the triumphs of peace and denounced war as the reign of violence and the scourge of the human race. Still earlier, in 1838, Hugh S. Legare of South Carolina, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, in the report on the petition from the New York Peace Society, declared that "peace is the hope of liberty, peace consecrated as the standing, fundamental policy of the world." And John C. Calhoun, in his speech in the United States Senate in 1842 on the Oregon Boundary question said, "I am on principle opposed to war and in favor of peace, because I regard peace as a positive good and war as a positive evil. . . . I oppose war not simply on the patriotic ground of a citizen, looking to the freedom and prosperity of his own country, but on still broader grounds, as a friend of improvement, civilization and progress." It is gratifying to see so large and influential a body as the State Teachers' Association of South Carolina awaking to the importance of the peace movement and citing with pride the enlightened sentiments on this question of some of their eminent statesmen of the last century.

The Bloch Foundation.

The committee having charge of the Bloch Foundation have just submitted their report for the year 1904 to the Commission of the International Peace Bureau. The original fund was fifty thousand roubles, the tenth part of which Mr. Bloch instructed should be used each year in the promotion of the particular line of peace propaganda in which he was specially interested. The amount of the budget for the year was $4,700, of which $3,565 was actually expended. This money was spent in the purchase of books of reference, in subventions to some of the peace society groups, in the production of lantern slides, in the publication of supplements to Mr. Bloch's "Future of War" and pamphlets in exposition of his ideas, in studies of questions liable to produce international conflicts, etc. One of the brochures published by the Committee in December, 1903, was on "Macedonia and Armenia," another upon the question of "Manchuria and Corea." Copies of these were sent to the Foreign Ministers of all the nations and to many leading newspapers. The war in the Far East was the subject of another publication issued in 1904. Other questions have been studied by the Committee with a view to further publications. The Committee has during the year considerably increased its collection of lantern slides, which are loaned to lecturers. It has also prepared a tabular analysis of Mr. Bloch's six volume work, and published in German, with the coöperation of A. H. Fried, two pamphlets entitled "The Burdens of Armed Peace" and "War and the Principles of Modern Science." The preparation of an "Encyclopedic Peace Dictionary" has also been commenced, and aid given in the publication and circulation of several important pamphlets prepared by Dr. Adolph Richter, Dr. Max Colben and others. The amount of the Bloch Fund at the present time is $23,547.50.

International Institute of Agriculture.

It is a most important step that King Victor Emmanuel of Italy has taken in proposing the creation of an International Institute of Agriculture. The proposal is meeting with general favor among other governments. In a letter to Prime Minister Giolitti the king explains his reasons for the step:

"The agricultural classes, generally the most numerous, have everywhere a great influence on the destiny of nations. But, living without any bond of union, they cannot coöperate efficaciously either for the improvement and distribution of their different products according to the demands of consumption, or for the protection of their interests in the markets, which in the case of the most important products of the soil are becoming more and more universal.

"An international institute might therefore be of great utility, if, kept free from all political bias, it should make it its aim to study the conditions of agriculture in the different countries of the world, and make report periodically on the quantity and quality of the harvests, in order that production might thereby be facilitated, commerce rendered less expensive and more expeditious, and prices be more conveniently fixed. This Institute, working in harmony with the different national bureaus already created for this purpose, would be able to furnish precise data on the conditions of agricultural labor in all places, and thus serve as a useful and accurate guide for emigrants. Through it united action could be taken for common defense against those diseases of plants and stock which separate action is unable to control. It would also exercise a beneficent influence on the development of rural coöperation, and upon agrarian insurance and credit."

The king thinks that such an Institute would be "a powerful element of peace," and he recommends the subject to the attention of his government.

Arbitration Group in Congress.

A meeting of the members of Congress belonging to the United States Group of the Interparliamentary Union for the Promotion of Arbitration was held in Washington on March 6. Hon. Richard Bartholdt, Chairman of the Group, and President of the Interparliamentary Union this year, was authorized to appoint delegates to the Conference of the Union which is to be held at Brussels in September. The members of the Group agreed upon three propositions to be submitted to the Brussels Conference. These were: that the members of the South and Central American parliaments be invited to become members of the Union; that, secondly, the jurisdiction

of the Hague Court should be extended to specific matters of controversy through a general treaty of obligatory arbitration among the powers which will be represented at the new Hague Conference; and, thirdly, that a regular Congress of the Nations be created, to meet at stated periods, to discuss international questions and make recommendations to the governments. These propositions are enough in themselves, if no other national Group presents any, to make a good program for the Brussels Conference. Mr. Bartholdt is to sail for Europe early in May to attend the meeting at Brussels of the Executive Council of the Union. At the Washington meeting on the 6th of March a good deal of time was given to the discussion of the character of the general treaty of obligatory arbitration which it is hoped that the next Hague Conference will adopt, and also to the nature of the Congress of Nations which the United States Group will recommend at Brussels to be put upon the program of the new Hague Conference. Mr. Bartholdt expects that every one of the South and Central American parliaments will accept the invitation and send delegates to the Brussels Conference.

Brevities.

. . . The date of the Fourteenth Universal Peace Congress, which it was decided at the Boston Congress should meet at Lucerne, Switzerland, has been fixed for September 19. The sessions will continue for five days from that date. The American Peace Society will be glad to be informed how many of its members expect to be in Europe at that time, that they may be officially appointed delegates.

. . . The provisional program of the coming Peace Congress at Lucerne, which has been sent out by the Berne Peace Bureau, includes the following subjects: A report on the events of the year; a report of a special commission on the economic causes of war; a report of the special committee appointed at Boston on the *rapprochement* of France and Germany; the organization of an international peace alliance; the neutralization of territories and water courses; arrest and reduction of armaments; the creation of a permanent congress of the nations; a report on the subject of a universal language, and various questions of propaganda.

. . . Bishop John H. Vincent, founder and director of the Chautauqua Association, makes the following interesting announcement in the *Chautauquan:*

"Our own country is taking the lead in movements making for international peace, and Chautauqua's "Social Progress Year" is a fitting time to inaugurate a new C. L. S. C. Memorial Day. We shall henceforth celebrate May 18, the date of the opening of the first Hague Conference, as International Peace Day. Special programs will be provided for Circles, and Chautauqua readers, who have shown themselves such enthusiastic students of social progress, will not need to be urged to use their influence in behalf of universal peace."

. . . Mr. George W. Tooill, editor of the *Ohio School Journal*, after consulting with the Secretary of the American Peace Society, is planning to secure the observance of the 18th of May as an International Peace Day in the schools of Ohio. He will publish in the May number of the *Journal* a program for the observance of May 18 this year, and hopes that hereafter the day may be generally observed in the schools of the State. It is much to be hoped that all other States will speedily follow the example.

. . . Speaking in New York on the evening of March 17, Rear Admiral Coghlan said that in three years more the United States navy will require 65,000 men. In other words, if the present policy is continued, by 1908 there will be more men in the navy than in the army.

. . . Congressman Hull has found a new argument for the increase of the navy. It is "the victorious Japanese," who "wish the Philippines," which we will have to fight for or sell! Poor, ill-fated country! Germany is upon us on the Atlantic, and Japan upon the Pacific! We must therefore build more ships, more ships, more ships! It is really a very funny thing, — the imagination of our navy promoters.

. . . The Japanese ambassador to France is said to have recently made this comment on the modern world's estimate of what constitutes civilization: "We Japanese have for many generations sent to Europe exquisite lacquer work, delicately carved figures, beautiful embroidery; but the European nations described us as uncivilized. We have recently killed some seventy thousand Russians, and every nation in Europe is wondering at the high degree of civilization we have attained."

. . . Under the Anglo-French agreement for the adjustment of all the outstanding differences between the two countries, an important arbitration is to take place before the Hague Court over the question of the French protectorate of the Sultan of Muscat. The French government has chosen from the Court Mr. Lohman of the Netherlands and the British government Chief-Justice Fuller of the United States. These two will choose a third member of the Court, to complete the tribunal for the adjudication of the case.

. . . In the treaties of commerce recently made by Germany with other governments, with the exception of that with Russia, clauses have been introduced providing for the submission to arbitration of any differences that may arise in the interpretation or application of the treaties.

. . . The members of the Swedish, Norwegian and Danish parliaments, after their generous reception at Paris, went to Monaco, where they were received by the Governor-General of the Principality, and made a visit to the Institute of Peace Studies, etc.

. . . Count Tolstoy has declared, since the St. Petersburg massacres, that he regards the soldier who fired on an unarmed crowd and the man who threw a bomb under the Grand Duke's carriage as equally abominable!

. . . The British government has, as a result of a debate in the House of Lords, refused to allow the War Office to interfere in the physical education of the children in the nation's schools.

. . . At the annual meeting of the French International Arbitration Society held on the 18th of February the following resolution was voted:

"The French International Arbitration Society met in general assembly on the 18th of February, believing that public and official subscription in a neutral country to State loans offered by a belligerent power constitutes a flagrant violation of neutrality, invites the groups of the Interparliamentary Union to bring this grave question to the attention of their respective governments."

. . . William Randal Cremer, M. P., who in December, 1903, received the Nobel Peace Prize, recently made a visit to Christiania and Stockholm. At Christiania he gave an address on arbitration in which he emphasized the important service which workingmen may render to the cause. A similar address was also given by him in Stockholm.

. . . The Arbitration Group in the French Chamber of Deputies has addressed a communication to the Minister of Foreign Affairs suggesting that the Hague Court should be used in the interpretation of treaties of commerce, where differences arise as to their meaning. M. Delcassé has promised to give the matter favorable consideration.

. . . On March 4 a meeting was held in London under the auspices of the Society of Friends for the promotion of international brotherhood. Among those who participated in the meeting were Canon Barker, Sir Thomas Barclay and Mr. John Burns, M. P. A resolution was adopted appealing to the newspapers of Great Britain and Germany to aid in promoting good feeling between the two countries by more cautious reports and utterances than had recently frequently been made.

. . . The *Worcester Telegram* says that "Manchuria is easily the death-centre of the world, and not over a few thousands of the dead ever knew what they were killing each other for. No more do the thousands who are still fighting know what it is all about."

. . . The North Sea Claim of Great Britain against Russia for the damage done by the Russian warfleet to the trawlers off the Dogger Bank, amounting to $325,000, was paid by Count Benkendorff to Foreign Secretary Lansdowne on the 9th of March, and the incident was thus closed.

. . . The French Chamber of Deputies, by a vote of 519 to 32, have adopted a measure reducing the term of active military service from three years to two.

. . . A resolution is to be presented to the parliaments of the States of the German Empire asking for a revision of the reading books in the schools, in order that they may have less influence in promoting a war spirit among the young.

. . . The Isthmian Canal Commission, appointed only about a year ago, have resigned, at the President's request, and a new commission will be appointed, more to the President's strenuous liking. This famous canal, which was to be built without delay after we had helped the little republic of Panama into existence, does not get dug at the President's gait, and does not seem likely to.

. . . Mr. Richard Feldhaus, who was one of the prominent European delegates to the Boston Peace Congress, has been giving, during the winter, a series of most effective lectures in various cities of Germany, — Mannheim, Frankfort, Munich, Heidelberg, etc.

. . . The poet, Frederic Mistral, who last December received the Nobel prize for his work in literature, has been made honorary president of the Society of the Friends of Peace at Marseilles, France.

. . . The annual meeting of the Wisbech Local Peace Association, one of the most active and efficient local peace organizations in England, was held on the 1st of March, under the presidency of Miss Priscilla H. Peckover. The evening's exercises were terminated by a performance of the Boys' Life-saving Brigade.

. . . The President has formally invited the nations of the earth to be represented at the celebration in 1907 of the first settlement of English-speaking people at Jamestown, Va., in 1607. But why could he not have invited them to send civilian representatives, instead of their warships and military men? What had the Jamestown settlement to do with army and navy?

. . . The Swedish Ladies' Peace Society is to hold a public meeting in Stockholm in May for the purpose of trying to secure the coöperation of the mothers of the nation in the cause of peace. A special invitation will be given to professors of history to attend the meeting.

. . . The new peace movement in South America has lost one of its ablest supporters by the death of Dr. Frederic Diez de Medina, president of the Central Peace Committee of Bolivia. He was professor of law in the University of La Paz.

. . . The boundary dispute between Costa Rica and the new Republic of Panama has been adjusted. President Roosevelt will appoint an engineer to act as umpire in tracing the boundary, according to the terms of the convention.

. . . An important meeting for the promotion of the cause of international peace was held in the Cooper Union, New York, on March 17, under the auspices of the People's Institute and the New York State Conference of Religion. The speakers were Hon. Oscar S. Straus of New York and Edwin D. Mead of Boston.

. . . The twenty-third conference of the International Law Association is to be held at Christiania, Norway, beginning on the 4th of September next. The program of the conference is being prepared by the secretaries and the Executive Council of the Association. A large attendance is expected.

. . . Baron Lambermont, who died recently in Belgium, was one of the foremost statesmen of Europe. He was an ardent supporter of international arbitration, and served on a number of tribunals of arbitration. He was honorary president of the Conference of the International Law Association at Antwerp in 1903.

Brave Brothers, Fight no More.

JULIA HARRIS MAY.

Brave brothers, fight no more;
We know that ye are brave;
But hear ye not the wounded and the dying?
Do ye not hear the little children crying
Across the angry wave?
Brave brothers, fight no more!

Brave brothers, fight no more;
We know that ye are true;
True to the cause ye think ye are upholding,
True to the children, and the arms enfolding
The little ones, whose lives your own are moulding.
Brave brothers, fight no more.

Brave brothers, fight no more.
The slaughter doth increase.
See how the blood in hideous streams is flowing!
See how the seeds of hate your hands are sowing!
Ye do this thing, not knowing, ah, not knowing.
Brave brothers, fight no more.

Brave brothers, fight no more.
Ye do not, cannot know;
So drunk with war, why are ye madly rushing,
And human skulls to formless atoms crushing —
To quick destruction souls and bodies pushing?
Brave brothers, fight no more.

Brave brothers, fight no more.
The scabbard for the sword!
Oh, listen to the notes of arbitration;
Call to your aid the wisdom of a nation;
Till every man of every rank and station
Shall hear the blessed word
That ye will fight no more.

Brave brothers, fight no more.
We know that ye are kind;
But brothers! brothers! will ye not remember,
While souls are dying in this dark September,
That love is best? Blow up its fading ember,
The light of truth to find.
Brave brothers, fight no more.

Brave brothers, fight no more.
Forgiveness is the best.
Do you not hear the Lord Christ sadly saying,
"My children, why are ye each other slaying?
My peace I left with you — are ye obeying?
Oh, make it manifest!"
Dear brothers, fight no more!

Efforts to Bring About Mediation Between Russia and Japan.

American Peace Society's Letter to Secretary Hay.

The letters which we publish below, the first from the President and Secretary of the American Peace Society to Secretary Hay, the second from the International Peace Bureau to the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of Great Britain and France, show that the peace organizations have not been unmindful of their duty in the crisis which the Eastern war has produced. It has not seemed proper to publish the first of these letters earlier. It was received in the most sympathetic way at Washington, as Mr. Hay's reply would show, if we were at liberty to publish it. The General Peace League of the Netherlands, the Peace Societies of Great Britain, France, Italy, Denmark, Norway and Sweden, etc., have likewise all taken similar energetic action:

JANUARY 9, 1905.

THE HON. JOHN HAY, SECRETARY OF STATE,

Dear Sir: The surrender of Port Arthur compels the civilized world to ask whether an opportunity has not now arisen to bring to an end the ghastly war between Russia and Japan. We believe the opportunity has come at least to make the attempt with reasonable chances of success.

The Hague Convention expressly provides in Article I. that "the Signatory Powers agree to use their best efforts to insure the pacific settlement of international differences."

Article II. provides that "the Signatory Powers agree to have recourse, as far as circumstances allow, to the good offices or mediation of one or more friendly powers."

Article III. declares that "the Signatory Powers consider it useful that one or more powers, strangers to the dispute, should, on their own initiative, and as far as circumstances will allow, offer their good offices or mediation to the states at variance. The right to offer good offices or mediation belongs to powers who are strangers to the dispute, even during the course of hostilities. The exercise of this right shall never be regarded by one or the other of the parties to the contest as an unfriendly act."

This is one of the most progressive agreements recorded in history. It grew out of Russian initiative. Russia cannot feel hurt if one or more friendly nations now avail themselves of this scheme for the benefit of both belligerents. Every possible consideration should be given to Russian sensitiveness in any action which may be taken.

What nation should take the initiative? America should lead, for many reasons: friendship and admiration towards Japan; ancient traditional friendship towards Russia; absolute impartiality; freedom from selfish motives; a certain recognized leadership among the nations, so that, on the initiative and at the request of America, many other great powers will be willing to join. All these considerations unite to impose a supreme responsibility on America to take the lead, and to invite and urge all the nations (twenty-four in all, omitting the belligerents) who signed the Hague Convention to join (as many as will coöperate within a reasonable time) in making a friendly tender of mediation to Russia and Japan.

Both of these nations no doubt now deeply deplore the outbreak of the war. Both no doubt are eager for its termination. It cannot be impossible to find a basis of adjustment which should be acceptable to both powers.

There is reason to believe that Japan will not insist on extreme terms. Russia could hardly refuse the basis of her pledge of October, 1903. She should restore the whole of Manchuria to China. Manchuria and Port

Arthur might well be committed for a considerable period to the equal direction of the six great powers, the United States, Great Britain, France, Germany, Japan and Russia, on the basis of universal free trade and the open door with equal rights to all nations, with Port Arthur made a great free harbor to the world's commerce, Russia to have there a railroad terminus of her Asiatic system.

The gain to the commerce of the whole world by this arrangement would be incalculable, not perhaps so much at first, but in the near future. The precedent would be for the future for China invaluable. One other consideration has weight. The whole vast Orient is forming relations with the Western world. If the imagination of the countless Chinese millions is now impressed with the leadership of America, not only in power, but in her influence for peace, the result may be of momentous value for all future time.

To make the effort at mediation succeed, many powerful allies exist, economic, moral and religious. The capitalists and bankers of Western Europe are loaded with bonds of Russia and may be relied on to work strenuously to induce Russia to make peace. The conscience of the world is outraged at the horrors and sufferings and cruelties of this diabolic warfare. The influence of the churches of the civilized world may be relied on to the utmost in behalf of peace.

Nor need America fear any loss of prestige if, in the worst event, Russia should at first and for a while decline to accept mediation.

The world expects some nation, preferably America, to be bold enough to make the offer.

The offer, if made, will receive the sanction and support and admiration of the world, and the immense moral weight of such a joint effort as is suggested would, there is strong ground for believing, make it practically irresistible. Are not the governments which signed the Hague Convention under more serious obligations than they seem yet to have realized to make one supreme combined effort to prevent the terrible conflict from continuing longer?

Pardon the frankness of this letter. You will know that it comes from men who rejoice to accord to your administration of the diplomacy of America profound respect and ardent admiration.

(Signed) ROBERT TREAT PAINE,
President of the American Peace Society.
BENJAMIN F. TRUEBLOOD,
Secretary of the American Peace Society.

Letter of the Berne Peace Bureau to the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of France and England.

BERNE, January 20, 1905.

Mr. Minister: The manifestation of the generous humanitarian conceptions which have dictated the course of the French [English] government on a number of occasions, notably in the matter of the international arbitration treaties recently concluded, inspires the peace societies with confidence as well as gratitude toward the high authorities who have shown themselves so deeply conscious of their duties and responsibilities. This consideration explains the step which we are taking the liberty of making with your Excellency in the name of the peace groups whose representatives we are, earnestly praying the French [English] government to examine anew the question of a tender of good offices by France and England to Russia and Japan with a view of bringing about an armistice and an end of the war in the Far East.

This result is ardently desired by the peoples of all civilized countries, whose interests are injured and whose moral sense is offended in the highest degree by the war. Everywhere is raised a cry of anguish by the peoples, who are looking anxiously to the leading powers with the conviction that an effort on their part to bring about peace would put an end to the massacres which the world has now been witnessing for nearly a whole year. Public opinion is convinced that this effort made in a conciliatory spirit would be successful, in view especially of the impression which the most recent incidents of the long, ruinous and cruel war must have produced upon the belligerents. Even if a choice should be necessary between the fear of seeing friendly intervention wrongly interpreted and regret at having lost a supreme opportunity to accomplish a great work for humanity, there can be no doubt what choice your government would make.

We do not pretend, Mr. Minister, to be able to point out any new way for you. We know, on the contrary, that you are following with the greatest solicitude the changes in the bloody drama which is unfolding itself in the Far East, and we have no question of the earnestness which your Excellency will show in taking advantage of any opportunity favorable for a tender of good offices such as will assure to both parties an honorable peace. With perfect confidence, therefore, we present this request, assured that in this matter we are the interpreters of a universal sentiment and a universal desire for peace and concord among the nations.

We take this occasion to present to your Excellency, etc.

For the International Peace Bureau.
(Signed) FREDRIK BAJER, *President.*
ELIE DUCOMMUN, *Secretary.*

International Arbitration at the Opening of the Twentieth Century.

BY BENJAMIN F. TRUEBLOOD.

International arbitration is a comparatively modern thing, belonging almost entirely to the period commencing with the opening of the nineteenth century. The arbitrations before that time were for the most part between individuals, communities, different branches of the same dynasty, or between vassal states and feudal chiefs, rather than between nations in our modern sense of the term. This method of settling difficulties between peoples came about with the decline of despotism and the growth of political liberty, and the consequent development and realization of the idea of nationality in its modern sense. Nations, in the sense of free and independent peoples, whose unity is natural and voluntary, and that observe in a measure the limits which have been marked out for them by the providence of God in the geographic structure of the earth and in the historic development of races, did not exist in any permanent way

much more than a hundred years ago. The movement toward settled and self-governed nations, which has resulted in the building up and compacting of this great Republic and in the unification of Great Britain, of France, of Italy, of Germany, and of other nations in both hemispheres to a greater or less extent, grew out of the many liberating and civilizing forces which have been playing on society since the beginning of the Christian era, to go no farther back, and with it has come sufficient international respect and unselfishness, a sufficient sense of the mutual interdependence of nations, to make arbitration not only possible but natural and inevitable. So long as feudalism remained, international arbitration was impossible, because there were really no nations to arbitrate. Even after the nations were somewhat settled in their proper boundaries, so long as they were ruled by men whose despotic and world-grasping spirit led them year after year into schemes for the subjection of other peoples, international arbitration in any general and settled way was still impossible. With the fall of Napoleon, in whom this spirit found its final embodiment, the old order of things was broken and the new began to appear.

Arbitration implies independent and mutually respecting parties standing over against each other, with difficulties which they cannot settle themselves, because of the strong feeling which each has that he is in the right and that he cannot therefore yield to the other's view. It also implies a conviction that there is a better and more rational, or at least a safer and less expensive, way of settling difficulties than that of fighting like brutes about them. It further implies confidence in the fairness and good sense of one's fellowmen, who may be called in to take the dispute and sit down with it in the impartial court of reason and say how it shall be adjusted.

It may easily be seen, therefore, why arbitration, though it may have taken place frequently between individuals and small bodies of men, could not, in the moral state of society then existing, have occurred much on an international scale prior to the opening of the nineteenth century. Not a little of the spirit of unrespecting selfishness and greed of the past centuries still lingers, and numberless jealousies and ill-feelings left behind by former aggressions and acts of injustice have rendered arbitration, until comparatively recently, much less frequent than it ought to have been; but its appearance in the nineteenth century in many important cases is a proof that not only individual men but the nations in their dealings one with another have gotten a good deal above the brute and have begun to be largely and generously human.

Before a detailed analysis of the arbitration movement during the past century is given, attention should be called a little more specifically to what arbitration in a simpler and narrower way accomplished in the past; for the present movement is not alone the outgrowth of Christian civilization in general, but also of the arbitrations themselves which are scattered along through the previous centuries. The movement has a purely human and rational side, so that even among pagan nations and before the Christian era cases of this mode of settling disputes are recorded, and many others doubtless occurred which have passed into oblivion. The madness and insanity of war did not always prevail. There were lucid moments when the real human nature temporarily asserted itself. Two sons of Darius settled the question of the succession to the throne by arbitration. Cyrus sought the good offices of a Prince of India to end a dispute between him and the king of Assyria. In the Greek civilization, where the state was everything and love of country an all-absorbing passion, cases of arbitration between Greek and Greek were not infrequent, though no Greek state seems ever to have arbitrated with a foreign country. In these the Amphictyonic Councils, famous sages, victors in the games and especially the Oracle at Delphi were the arbitrators. The system of law and of law courts, in which the citizens of a country determine their questions by a forced litigation under the power of the civil authorities, has its root in some of the same principles as arbitration. In the Roman empire this system prevailed, and the simpler method of voluntary arbitration was not much known.

When Christianity came with its doctrine of love and human brotherhood, arbitration became a frequent and probably the usual method by which difficulties between individual Christians were settled. The reader will remember Paul's passionate appeal to the Corinthians in behalf of this simple Christian method as against the forced and selfish litigations in the law courts.

In later times the bishops' trials became a fixed institution among Christians. If the history of these Christian settlements by arbitration could be written, it would take a very large library to contain the accounts of them. They have been numerous through all the Christian centuries, and are still frequent in our own time. Not a year has passed, it may be safely asserted, since the first organization of Christian societies, in which many a bishop, minister or wise Christian layman, either alone or with others, has not by arbitration or mediation adjusted differences between brethren. The practice thus created and fostered by Christian love and forbearance has largely leavened the whole of society with its influence, and its reasonableness is now nearly universally recognized, even where temporary gusts of passion or hereditary prejudices prevent its employment in particular cases. It is on this basis of Christian principle and practice, running back to the days of the Prince of Peace, that the whole structure of modern international arbitration rests.

What was found so useful and practicable among individuals was naturally seen to be just as capable of successful application to groups and communities of men, and it began early to be so applied. Private war, the great curse of the middle ages, was banished from European society only after the application to it of arbitration and arbitration courts. Feudalism had spread this evil everywhere. Challenges to battle were made for the most trivial and absurd causes. A state of almost utter lawlessness came to prevail, and strife and bloodshed were perpetual. Religious sentiment was invoked against the evil. The clergy preached peace. Men went from village to village proclaiming it in the name of Christ. Great councils were held to promote it. The popes sent out encyclicals in its behalf. The "Peace of God" was proclaimed, and certain days, places and callings were placed under the protection of its sheltering wing. Religious fraternities or peace associations to reconcile enemies were formed. Pledges of peace were administered to the fierce barons over holy relics. But the tide of hatred and of blood surged on. Finally, as a last

remedy, when all the efforts put forth for nearly two centuries against the evil seemed about to end in failure, courts of arbitration were formed by the barons, the nobles, the bishops and the cities, and for two centuries and more were applied to the settlement of the almost endless misunderstandings and quarrels of the time. In this way private war was ultimately banished from society.

From the beginning of the sixteenth to the opening of the nineteenth century we have the great war movements of nationalities — aggression, bloodshed and desolation on a colossal scale. The feudal lords are replaced by kings and emperors in whom the old feudal spirit still lives. Private war with its everlasting bickerings and its petty troops of galloping dragoons and murderous squads of footmen gives place to war between sovereigns and whole peoples, with their great generals, their large armies, their deep-seated hatreds and their craftily laid plans of territorial extension. No sooner are national boundaries marked off than they are disturbed. The map of Europe changes with nearly every campaign. "I saw," said Grotius writing at this time, "throughout all Christendom a readiness to make war which would cause the very barbarians to blush for shame." England, France, Prussia, Austria, Spain, Italy, the Netherlands, were almost continuous battlefields on which the sound of the cannon was always heard and the blood never ceased to flow. This long, gloomy period of international aggression and crime,— the age of Charles the Fifth, of Henry the Eighth, of Bloody Mary, of Frederic the Great, of Charles the Twelfth, of Louis the Fourteenth, of Napoleon the First; the age of the Inquisition and of the French Revolution; the age of the Seven Years' War, of the Thirty Years' War, or rather the age of perpetual war, — reached its culmination at the opening of the nineteenth century in the Napoleonic campaigns which ended at Waterloo. Then a reaction came. The common conscience began to revolt at the sight of human beings forever devouring one another and of selfish, haughty sovereigns treading down and destroying all the most sacred rights and interests of men.

The first steps of this revolt had been taken in the seventeenth century. Christian conviction had become such and Christian principles had so influenced thought that the war system began to be attacked at its very roots. It was declared to be both unchristian and unreasonable. Hugo Grotius, the great Dutch jurist and theologian, who laid the foundations of the modern juridic movement against war, attacked it particularly on the latter ground. He declared that war was a cruel and unsatisfactory method, that its horrors should be mitigated and that arbitration should be substituted for it as far as practicable in the settlement of difficulties. He expounded his doctrine with so much erudition and force that he deeply affected the thought of Europe, and laid the foundation of a better international law. Publicists took up the problem which he had raised. The law of nations was unfolded and emphasized. Projects for universal peace were drawn up. Locke, Kant, Penn, Pufendorf, Vattel, Montesquieu, Bentham and others drew up schemes which have had a powerful influence on thought ever since. Lessing and Herder put the new ideas into verse. The foundations of the modern movement were likewise laid deep in the religious sentiment by Menno Simons, by George Fox, and later by John Wesley.

Soon after the opening of the nineteenth century the movement against war took on an organized and definitive form. This organized movement growing out of these historic preparations and coming as a revolt against the bloody régime of the three preceding centuries, followed two lines of development, one sentimental, the other juridic. The sentimental, or that for the awakening and education of public sentiment against war, manifested itself during the nineteenth century in the organization of peace societies, in sermons and public lectures, in literary productions, through the press, through international congresses and conferences, through public manifestos and memorials to governments; the juridic, or that for the creation of legal remedies for war, expressed itself in improved diplomacy, in attempts to reform international law, in arbitration and in efforts for the establishing of permanent treaties of arbitration and a permanent international tribunal. These two lines of movement, one of which is just as important as the other, have been interlaced at every stage and have grown strong together. The culmination of the arbitration side of the movement in actual practice during the last decade and a half has been very remarkable, as is now well known.

The Jay Treaty of 1794, between the United States and Great Britain, provided for the settlement of three questions by mixed commissions. The first of these commissions, appointed to determine what river was meant by the St. Croix in the treaty of 1783, rendered its decision in 1798. The second commission failed to render a decision, and the matter of British claims referred to it was settled by treaty in 1802. The third commission, appointed to determine the loss suffered by American vessels at the hands of Great Britain during the war between that country and France, closed its labors in 1804. These settlements by mixed commissions were not formally arbitrations, though they were essentially so. The method of adjusting disputes by joint commissions has continued in vogue up to the present time, and no less than three hundred controversies between nations have in this way been disposed of since the beginning of the nineteenth century. Many of these were questions of claims, but some of them, like the Alaska boundary dispute, were controversies of the first importance.

The Treaty of Ghent, December 24, 1814, provided for the formal arbitration of three questions between the United States and Great Britain. The first of these referred to certain islands in the Passamaquoddy Bay, and was decided by commissioners in 1817. The solution of the second question, that of the northeastern boundary of the United States, was attempted by commissioners in 1816. They failed to agree, and in 1827 the question was referred to the King of the Netherlands, whose decision, in 1831, was waived by both governments and the matter was finally settled by compromise. The third question, that of the northern boundary of the United States along the Great Lakes, was partially settled by commissioners in 1822, and finished in 1842 by treaty. These commissions had an umpire, and the settlements were therefore formal arbitrations. Similar settlements of claims by arbitral commissions were made at this early period between the United States and Spain, and France and Russia.

Since the time of the Treaty of Ghent, 1814, about two hundred and thirty-eight international controversies have been settled by arbitration, or an average of nearly three a year for the whole period of ninety years. More than sixty of these were in the decade from 1890 to 1900 and twenty-one of them have occurred since the twentieth century opened. So common has the practice of arbitration become in recent years that cases are nowadays constantly pending between some of the nations, there being several at the present time. The United States has been a party to nearly sixty of these settlements; Great Britain to more than seventy; while fourteen of the cases have been between these two English-speaking nations alone. France, Spain, Portugal, Germany, Italy, Holland, Denmark, Belgium, Russia, Greece, Turkey, Switzerland, Japan, Afghanistan, Persia, China, Morocco, Mexico and Liberia have each been parties to one or more of these settlements, France, with over thirty cases, coming next to the United States and Great Britain. All of the South American and Central American States except two or three have had arbitrations.

It is to be noticed that along with these cases adjusted by arbitration must be placed a large number settled by diplomacy, many of which would formerly have produced war. Many modern diplomats have been in the truest sense of the term peacemakers, and have not only prevented war, but the necessity even of arbitration.

The nations referred to as having taken part in these pacific settlements — some thirty-seven of them all told — cover a large part of the habitable portion of the globe, and include a considerable number of countries not usually thought to be much civilized.

The cases referred to cover nearly every sort of question with which nations have to deal in their relations to one another — questions of boundary and violation of territory, of trespasses committed and injuries received in time of war, of the murder of citizens of one country by those of another, of disputed sovereignty over islands, questions of protectorates, of seizure of ships, of interference with commerce, of fisheries, etc. Some of the controversies have been the occasion of diplomatic correspondence carried on for months, sometimes for years, by some of the ablest statesmen of modern times. In some instances, after diplomacy had exhausted its resources, the cases were dropped for a time, only to be taken up again and finally referred to disinterested parties. Large sums of money have been involved in a number of the disputes, no less than $22,000,000 having changed hands in the three cases between the United States and Great Britain in 1871. The sense of national dignity and honor has often been keenly touched in the earlier stages of the controversies, and the newspapers on both sides have not infrequently tried to kindle the flame of war.

All these difficulties, though of exactly the same kind as those which in former times resulted speedily in disastrous and often long-continued wars, have, however, finally been settled with no great delay, with a trifling outlay of money, and without the least injury to the self-respect or honor of any country involved. The decisions have, with one or two trifling exceptions, been accepted cheerfully and faithfully carried out, and not the shadow of a war-cloud has ever been produced by one of them. On the contrary, the result has nearly invariably been increased mutual respect and a greater willingness to coöperate in all practicable ways for the common good.

For many years past the number of difficulties settled by arbitration has greatly exceeded the number of international controversies which have led to war, and the rule of the past has become the exception of the present. But one war makes more fuss in the world and gets more notice in the newspapers than a hundred arbitrations. These arbitration settlements have taken place so noiselessly and with so little public excitement that the ordinary well-read citizen could not name more than three or four out of the whole two hundred, and the real triumphs of the principle are therefore only vaguely and imperfectly realized. Arbitration as a method of settling international controversies has already won its case and justified itself at the bar of human reason, and has become, as Mr. David Dudley Field said in the last paper but one that he ever wrote, a recognized part of the public law of the civilized nations.

The crowning event of the nineteenth century in the matter of arbitration, an event which grew out of the whole work of the century was the establishment, at its close, of the Permanent International Court at The Hague. Such a court of arbitration had been advocated from the second decade of the century by the Peace Societies, and later by the International Law Association, the Peace Congresses, the Interparliamentary Union, national and local bar associations, special arbitration conferences, church assemblies, women's organizations, etc.

The Rescript of the Czar of Russia which brought about the Conference at The Hague was issued on the 24th of August, 1898. The Conference met on the 18th of May, 1899, under the auspices of the Netherlands government. It was composed of one hundred delegates sent by twenty-six nations, including all the first-class powers of the world. It sat until the 29th day of July. It was called more particularly to consider the question of a possible reduction of the armaments and the war budgets of the nations. It found itself unable to do anything important in this direction, and in response to the multiplied appeals which came to it from Western Europe and America, it took up the subject of a permanent system of arbitration, and at its close signed, with two other conventions, the Convention for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes. This convention, in addition to providing for special mediation to prevent war and for commissions of inquiry in cases of difference where the facts were in dispute, made provision for the creation of a Permanent International Court of Arbitration, which should be open, for the adjudication of disputes, to all the signatory powers, and to any others that might subsequently be permitted to become parties to the convention.

Within two years a sufficient number of the signatories had ratified the convention to put it into effect, and in April, 1901, the Court was declared by the Netherlands Minister of Foreign Affairs to be properly organized and ready for business. The Convention was finally ratified by all the signatory powers except China, Turkey, Persia and Montenegro, which have not yet acted. The total number of members of the Court is now seventy-two, each of the signatory powers being authorized by the Convention to appoint not to exceed four.

The Court, after some studied neglect by certain powers, was set into successful operation by the United States and Mexico by the reference to it, in May, 1902, of the controversy about the Pious Fund of the Californias, which had been long pending between the two countries. The case was argued in September and October of that year by counsel of the two governments before the tribunal of five members chosen from the Court, and at the end of four weeks the award, sustaining the contention of the United States, was rendered. The expenses of the trial were small. The judgment of the Court was cheerfully accepted by the Mexican government, the amount of the claims paid, and the controversy passed out of existence.

This auspicious opening of the Permanent International Court of Arbitration was followed by the reference to it the following year of the controversy which arose in connection with the Venezuela trouble as to whether the three powers which had used force against Venezuela in an effort to collect debts due their citizens should have preference over the pacific creditors in the payment of these claims from the revenues from two ports which had been set apart for this purpose. In this famous case eleven of the powers of the world were contestants before the Court. The decision of the tribunal, which consisted of three members chosen from the Court, was rendered after long and patient deliberation. It was a surprise and disappointment to many of the friends of peace, but it was loyally accepted by all the powers concerned.

There are now two controversies before the Hague Court: the House Tax Case between Japan on the one hand and Great Britain, France and Germany on the other, and the question of the protectorate of France over the Sultan of Muscat, to which Great Britain and France are parties.

It will thus be seen that the permanent international tribunal for the adjustment of differences between the nations has been organized and has entered successfully on its great career much sooner than even the most sanguine had a decade ago dared to hope.

But the work done in its organization, immensely important as it was, was an incomplete one. Not all the nations of the world were parties to the Convention, and none of them were pledged by treaty stipulations to submit controversies to the jurisdiction of the newly organized tribunal. An attempt to remedy the first defect was made at the second Pan-American Conference held at Mexico City in the winter of 1901-2. The important work of this Conference was done along the line of arbitration. All the states of the Western Hemisphere signed by their representatives in that gathering a protocol declaring their adherence to the Hague Conventions, and the United States and Mexico were authorized to take the necessary steps for the opening of these conventions to them. This work has not yet been completed, and it is not possible to give any conjecture as to when it will be done. A second protocol signed at Mexico City provided for the obligatory reference of all questions of claims to the arbitration of the Hague Court. This protocol has been ratified by a number of the signatories, and will doubtless soon be by all of them.

The second defect in the constitution of the Hague Court, if defect it may be called, it has been sought to remedy by securing the conclusion of special treaties of obligatory arbitration between the nations two and two or in groups. This movement has culminated with surprising and encouraging rapidity.

Previously to the setting up of the Hague Court all efforts to secure treaties of arbitration between nations had failed. As early as 1883 the Swiss government had approached our own with this end in view, but nothing came of it. The general treaty of arbitration for the American republics drafted at the first Pan-American Conference in 1889-1890 lapsed and was never ratified. Ten years of earnest effort for an arbitration treaty between Great Britain and the United States ended in the signing of the Olney-Pauncefote treaty at the opening of 1897. This treaty also failed in the United States Senate. The same year a general treaty of arbitration was negotiated between Italy and the Argentine Republic, but it never went into effect.

The labor spent in behalf of these unratified treaties had a powerful enlightening influence, and contributed much to the success of the Hague Conference.

After the Hague Convention went into effect and the Permanent Court of Arbitration was established, new efforts began to be put forth for special treaties of obligatory arbitration, this time stipulating reference of controversies to the newly established tribunal. These efforts have been remarkably successful, though not yet completely so. No less than twenty-nine treaties of this type have already been signed, namely, between Great Britain and France, France and Italy, Great Britain and Italy, Denmark and The Netherlands, France and Spain, Great Britain and Spain, Spain and Portugal, France and the Netherlands, France and Norway and Sweden, Great Britain and Norway and Sweden, Great Britain and Germany, Great Britain and Austro-Hungary, Russia and Belgium, the United States and France, the United States and Germany, the United States and Switzerland, the United States and Portugal, Switzerland and Great Britain, Switzerland and Italy, Switzerland and Belgium, the United States and Great Britain, the United States and Italy, Belgium and Sweden and Norway, Austro-Hungary and Switzerland, Russia and Sweden and Norway, the United States and Sweden and Norway, Switzerland and France, Switzerland and Norway and Sweden, the United States and Japan.

About half of these treaties have already been ratified and are now in force. But for the unfortunate conflict between the Senate of the United States and the President as to their respective powers and prerogatives, the eight treaties negotiated by Secretary Hay would also now be in force. But the failure of these United States treaties is after all only an incident, and will not appreciably affect the great sweep of the movement which is now rapidly carrying everything before it. The people of the United States, public men and private citizens, religious bodies and great commercial and trade organizations, were never so hearty and united as now in their support of the principle of arbitration and their determination that it shall be carried to a successful issue. The organization last year of a group of the Interparliamentary Union in the United States Congress with a membership of more than forty, the appropriation by

Congress of fifty thousand dollars to entertain the delegates to the Interparliamentary Conference at St. Louis, the outspoken and ardent support of arbitration by the President and the Secretary of State, are a sufficient interpretation of the advanced position of the nation on this great issue.

These special treaties of obligatory arbitration, with the one exception, lack much of being ideal, as they run for but five years, and provide only for the reference to the Hague Court of questions of a judicial order and those regarding the interpretation of treaties. With the exception of the Danish-Netherlands treaty, which has no limitations either in regard to time or to classes of cases, they all exclude from their operation questions which affect the vital interests and the "honor" of the signatories, very vague and indefinite conceptions. But in spite of their limitations, they mark a great step forward. The simple fact that great and mighty nations have become willing to pledge themselves in advance to submit important classes of disputes to a disinterested tribunal, the creation of their own joint action, speaks more eloquently than any words can possibly do of the growing international respect for law, of the more rational and humane attitude which the nations in general now bear toward one another, an attitude before which war with its unspeakable cruelties and its conspicuous failures of justice cannot long survive.

In South America, whose states are not yet parties to the Hague Convention, arbitration has made just as great progress as elsewhere. Ten of the republics, at the Pan-American Congress at Mexico City, in addition to recording their adherence to the Hague Conventions, signed a treaty for the arbitration of all disputes between them. Chile and the Argentine Republic, after settling their long-standing boundary dispute by arbitration, concluded in June, 1903, some months before the signing of the Anglo-French treaty, a general treaty of arbitration to run for five years and covering all disputes except such as might involve the national independence. This was noteworthy as the first treaty of obligatory arbitration ever concluded between two nations in the history of the world. There resulted from it a still more remarkable treaty, namely, one under which the two governments undertook to reduce,— and have reduced,— to a considerable degree both their armies and their navies — the first treaty of general disarmament in the history of the world. Treaties of obligatory arbitration have also been concluded between some others of the South American states.

It is clear from the array of facts here cited, setting forth the progress of arbitration between the nations within a century — and their force could be greatly increased by further detail — that we are rapidly approaching the day of the culmination of the movement in a complete and universal system. Unless history reverses its processes the Hague Court is in a comparatively short period to become a world-court, in which all the nations great and small will share on equal terms. The present movement for special treaties of obligatory arbitration which has accomplished so much within fifteen months, will eventuate in a few years in a general universal treaty solemnly signed in a great world conclave by representatives of all the independent states of the earth. There is already prospect that this will be one of the two or three chief items upon the program of the new International Conference at The Hague, which the government of the United States has already taken the first steps to convoke, and which is certain to meet within a year or two.

In spite of the sanguinary conflict in the Far East, possibly all the more because of its horrible lessons, the twentieth century has every prospect of seeing, before it is very old, arbitration by a high court of the nations take permanently and universally the place of "grim-visaged war."

Women and War.

BY GRACE ISABEL COLBRON.

One of the most tantalizing manifestations of that lack of logic which is popularly supposed to be the most charmingly feminine trait of the truly feminine mind, is the ability to be moved to emotion by isolated facts and single pictures, while ignoring utterly their connection one with another — the thread of thought and inter-relation which alone can give them their true significance.

To be absolutely frank, we should confess that this trait is not altogether a stranger to the superior masculine mind either; but it is certainly not so distinctively a sex characteristic as it is, unfortunately, with women. It is the trait that awakens hope within the breast of the ardent reformer who appeals to feminine tenderness and pity, only to receive a cold shower dash in the realization of an utter non-comprehension of his idea, in spite of ready tears and real sympathy with the sad pictures he paints.

Take the matter of war, for instance, with its present political manifestations of imperialism and militarism. Advocates of peace who really understand not the sentimental significance only, but the actual political and economic meaning of the words "war" and "peace," find ready sympathizers among women when they paint the agony of the battlefield, the misery of the bereaved home. But in the midst of their tears, a strain of martial music without will draw these same women to the window with enthusiastic exclamations of, "Oh, the gallant soldier boys! Don't they look fine!" They utterly fail to see the moral and ethical connection between the thing that arouses their enthusiasm and the thing that draws their tears; they utterly fail to realize that just as long as this absurd and unjustified glorification of brute force in the form of militarism continues, just so long will wars be fatally easy to enter into, just so long will imperialistic despotism and commercial tyranny find in the army a ready weapon for their selfish ends.

If women would stop weeping over the "silent, upturned face," and admiring the outer trappings that mark the licensed murderer, long enough to think a little about the connection between the two, the cause of peace would take a seven-league stride onward.

For the woman who thinks comes naturally first of all to think of the good of her sex, and to concern herself about questions pertaining thereto; and for a woman interested in the welfare of woman as a sex, this question of war and militarism is so fundamental that it is incomprehensible how so many can still be blind to its significance.

The mother, wife, sweetheart and sister, weeping at home for the absent or the dead, are supposed to be the chief sufferers from war's devastations. In reality they are but a few isolated cases, whose sorrows are as nothing compared to what the sex as a whole has suffered from the sway of militarism throughout the ages and the point of view fostered by it.

It is this spirit of militarism, the glorification of brute force, and this alone, that has kept woman in political, legal and economic bondage throughout the ages, and there is still enough of it remaining in our enlightened twentieth century to make the idea of woman's participation in public office and public life a thing to be scoffed at by the majority, ridiculed and opposed.

It was not any manifestation of superiority of the masculine mind that first threw the chains of political serfhood around one-half of humanity; it was merely the fact that in the dark ages of the world's history brute force,—that is, militarism in one or another form,—reigned supreme. Where brute force was lord, woman with her differently constituted muscular development was considered an inferior being simply because she did not bear arms.

It was not that she could not fight, but that instinctively, even in the "dim red dawn of man," prehistoric man felt that giving life was greater than taking it; and woman, as the giver of life, was to be kept back from the possibility of unnecessary physical danger.

From this feeling, become unthinking and uncomprehended tradition, grew the idea that woman was inferior in bodily strength, and could not bear arms, and therefore was an inferior being.

Nineteenth century man, as far as he began to think at all, began to understand that brute force was not everything, began to find it necessary to discover another reason for woman's political and legal position; and thus was born the legend of woman's inferior mentality.

Mediæval man was far more honest in his brutal "Only man, who bears arms, can have a voice in the affairs of his country's politics." Mediæval man was consistent, too, and excluded even that part of the male population that did not bear arms from public estimation and from public affairs. Modern man has grown more enlightened with respect to his own sex, but enough of militarism still lingers to make very hard the path of the woman struggling for legal, political and economic rights for her sex.

The wonder is that so many even of these women do not understand the point of view born of the traditions of centuries of militarism that still opposes them in the solid front of the unthinking conservative mass.

While the military ideal holds sway in our modern world, woman suffrage and the attainment of full legal and political rights for women will remain a Utopian dream. The military state is the state in which woman has no place; the military mind is the mind that sees in woman only a drudge or a toy, and gives her the one right only to existence — the possibility of bearing sons who will in time become soldiers.

Women may work for the improvement of their minds, they may open schools for their sex, they may make their way in art, in commerce, in the professions, they may prove in a thousand ways their fitness to take part in public life, — but it will avail them little so long as one vestige of the tradition and the point of view born of militarism remains in the civilized world. The military point of view is that of contempt for woman, of a denial to her of any other usefulness than that of bearing children.

This is not an exaggeration, for although the military mind, being an anachronism in our modern world, must of itself be illogical, it has certain instinctive forms of thought which are born of strictly logical reasoning.

The most cursory survey of civilized nations to-day will prove the truth of this. The inferior position of women in Germany is not by any means due to a lack in the mentality of the German woman, nor to a lack of educational facilities for either sex in a country justly proud of its magnificent school system. It is simply and solely due to the fact that at present the "nation of poets and thinkers" has for a time sold its birthright of mental preëminence for a mess of pottage — military glory and rampant imperialism.

What is it that has made the American woman the admiration of all civilized nations, the envy of her sisters elsewhere? She was not sent down fresh from Heaven in her present state, nor did she spring full-grown from the head of Jove. She was the daughter of mothers born in the military-ridden states of Europe. But now she is the product of several generations of freedom from the military idea. This, and this alone, has given her a measure of freedom beyond that attained by women anywhere else.

Let American women think seriously on this matter of war and peace, on this question of imperialism and militarism. If our nation should by any unfortunate but highly improbable combination of circumstances take her place amid the army-ridden, land-stealing world powers, it would mean much more to the American woman than a succession of wars that would bereave her of her loved ones, or send them back to her crippled or afflicted with loathsome disease. It would mean for American woman as a sex the loss of much she has gained by her happier circumstances of the past two centuries, and it would place the goal of perfect political and legal equality she still desires far, far out of reach,— in a cloudland which even the most hopeful could scarcely vision.

American woman's being what she is is our greatest safeguard against the evils that appear to threaten us; but the trouble is, the American woman is what she is only instinctively and unconsciously as yet, and there are far too many of her in the ranks of those who look upon these threatening evils as something good to be desired. — *The Public.*

One Other Neutral Water Way.

The article appearing in the current number of the ADVOCATE OF PEACE, under the heading "Neutral Zones on the Atlantic," cites, in support of the resolution of the Massachusetts State Board of Trade favoring the extension of "what may be called the 'ferry ways' of the great commerce passing over the Atlantic," the neutralization of the Suez Canal, and, likewise, the practical neutralization of the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence River, through the operation of the beneficent agreement of 1817 between Great Britain and the United States.

This simple but as yet altogether efficient agreement, promulgated under the presidency of James Monroe, is representative of an international "doctrine" which it is to be hoped may be perpetual between the two nations which subscribed to it.

In referring to this subject, however, I desire more particularly to call attention to the fact that the waters of the Strait of Magellan have also, since the year 1881, been internationally known as neutral. In compliance with the request made to the Department of State, several years after the above date, for the exact wording of the stipulation entered into between Chile and the Argentine Confederation, I received the following transcription (in Spanish) of the text of Article V. of said treaty:

"El Estrecho de Magallanes queda neutralizado en perpetuidad y asegurada su libre navegacion para las banderas de todas las Naciones. En el interes de asegurar esta libertad no se construiren en las costas fortificaciones ni defensas militares que puedan contrariar ese proposito." (The Strait of Magellan to remain perpetually neutral, and its free navigation assured to the flags of all nations. With the intent of securing this immunity, it is forbidden to construct on the coasts thereof any fortifications or military defenses which would defeat such purpose.)

In connection with this notable treaty, it is proper to state that it was largely effected through the good offices of the United States Ministers (both bearing the name of Osborn) at the capitals of Chile and the Argentine Confederation. Not only was the neutralization of the Strait secured, but a permanent settlement was reached of the long-standing dispute between the two republics as to their respective rights of ownership in the territory theretofore called Patagonia. Obviously the Anglo-Saxon had a hand in establishing that condition of assured amity between the republics which lately led them to make sale of their useless battleships, and to formally set up an emblem of perpetual concord on their Andean boundary line. JOSIAH W. LEEDS.

WESTCHESTER, PA., March 27, 1905.

What the United States Should Do to Promote a General Treaty of Obligatory Arbitration at the Next Hague Conference.

[Hon. Richard Bartholdt's view as given in an interview in the New York *Tribune*.]

The first fruit of the recent congress of the Interparliamentary Union was the action of President Roosevelt in calling the international conference for some early date at The Hague. The next material result was the negotiation of the arbitration agreements with England, Germany, France, Italy, Switzerland and Spain, but this was nullified by the action of the Senate. Of course, the attitude of the Senate was based on the belief that the treaty making right of that body under the constitution would be violated if the Executive could take the initiative in the adjustment of international differences. If they are right in that interpretation, it is certainly regrettable that the constitution presents an obstacle to the advancement of the cause of international arbitration. It is a fact, however, that the very senators who felt called on to defend the constitution are earnest friends of arbitration.

I was greatly depressed by the action of the Senate, and for a time felt that we had been set back a hundred years in the work for the world's peace; but I have come to entertain a different view of the situation. On Saturday last, accompanied by Hayne Davis, I called on the President, with whom we had a full and free interchange of views. I then said to the President that the practical rejection of the treaties by their amendment might not be such a calamity after all, but rather a blessing in disguise. I called attention to the fact that the treaties that had been negotiated were modeled after the Anglo-French treaty, which, for obvious reasons, would be somewhat restricted in its scope. Only judicial questions and those differences growing out of earlier treaty provisions came within the limitations of the agreements which are now regarded by the President as belonging to the category of closed incidents. It will now be possible, however, to formulate a treaty that will enumerate a large number of specific subjects, on which the contracting powers will be willing, if differences arise, to refer them for adjustment to the Hague Tribunal — questions that will not invade the inhibited field of national honor or independence or vital interest.

The subjects can, of course, only be determined by careful study, and the list may be utilized in variable measure — in whole or in part, as the contracting parties could determine. The result would be greatly to broaden the scope of the arbitration agreement, and enlarge its usefulness. This idea appealed to the President.

It would be my thought that the early appointment of the American representatives to the Hague Conference would make it possible for them to compare notes and propose subjects that could properly be regarded as admissible of arbitration. They could take the public into their confidence through the press, and popular sentiment would help to mould and refine the distinctively American view. Other powers would by this means also become cognizant of our attitude in advance of the conference at The Hague. I believe this means of enhancing the practical usefulness of international arbitration will appeal to the various powers already committed to the peace propaganda. I believe also that sympathetic action in the Hague Conference would go far to assure the subsequent exchange of ratifications, and that the cause of arbitration would so be broadened and its vital force extended.

A Business Man's View of the Senate's Action on the Arbitration Treaties.

[Mr. Arthur B. Farquhar, of York, Pa., Vice-President of the National Association of Manufacturers, a well-known manufacturer and political economist, and a most active supporter of the international arbitration and peace movement, has sent us the following communication which was recently published in the Philadelphia *Public Ledger*. We are very glad to reproduce it for our readers, the more so as Mr. Farquhar has recently become a member of the American Peace Society.]

The final consummation of a treaty is something that requires considerable time, under our form of government, owing to the necessity of a vote of two-thirds of the Senate in its favor to give it validity. More for that

reason than any other, doubtless, this country has been unable to keep its place at the front in the general movement of the nations to give full effect to the beneficent work of the Hague Conference. After the prominent and very creditable part taken by our representatives at that Conference and the readiness shown by us to submit a disagreement with Mexico to the arbitration of the Hague Tribunal, it might have been anticipated that no country on earth would step ahead of us in the work of securing to that tribunal continued vigor and usefulness. But the fact has been otherwise. Treaties between Great Britain and other European nations, providing for the submission of their disagreements to arbitration at The Hague, are now more than a year old, yet our country has concluded no such treaty. Our State Department has not been idle; eight admirable treaties of similar description have been for some months before the Senate; yet the labor of their preparation has come to nothing.

The point at issue between the Executive and the Senate is understood to be a single word. The treaties as originally drawn provided that the questions to be passed upon by the arbitrators should be settled by "agreement," but an overwhelming majority of Senators insist that the tribunal's work must be set for it by "treaty." The difference in the two words is that the latter does, while the former does not, require the affirmative action of two-thirds of the Senate to make an arbitration possible.

The practical effect of the change of the word is to convert the treaties before the Senate into waste paper; for what else is the treaty under which nothing can be done until another treaty is drawn up to set it in operation? John Doe, let us say, offers to deed me a tract of land, reserving the conditions that I am not to plant it, or pasture it, or build on it, without securing the right from him by a new contract — what is his first deed worth? Obviously, if there must be a later treaty, there need be no preliminary one.

The right of the Senate to insist on amendments to treaties on which it has to pass is not contested. That the Senate, in amending, will always see that its own powers and privileges are amply recognized may be taken for granted. Whether the desired recognition of senatorial powers and privileges was something important enough to justify a crippling of eight arbitration treaties, a halt when the country looked for a forward march, was a matter for that body to decide. Nevertheless, in the opinion of the people generally, the matter has been decided unwisely.

That the decision, moreover, is said to have been influenced by the interest of certain of our States in keeping the question whether the non-payment of their old obligations is or is not repudiation altogether out of foreign hands, is a circumstance not calculated to give us greater confidence in it. But whether this suggestion be true or untrue, there can be no doubt that the influences that led the Senate to amend the word "agreement" into the word "treaty" were influences antagonistic to the principle of international arbitration. In taking this step, that powerful body has gone a long way toward the camp of the opposition — dragging the unwilling country in its grasp. It has taken a long step backward.

Whether negotiations leading to international arbitration shall be made through the executive or legislative branch of our government is not in itself a matter with which the cause of arbitration is deeply concerned. The cause is concerned, however, with the efficiency of the agency to which it is intrusted, and on which all application of it depends. It is a grave mistake to depend for good work on an unwieldy tool. If what we desired were an arbitration that would not arbitrate, we could not find a more suitable means for attaining it than by committing it to the deliberative branch of our national government, a council which is more than half the time scattered throughout this huge country, and whose treatment of proposed treaties, when it happens to be in session, is illustrated by the fate of the Olney-Pauncefote arbitration treaty and the McKinley-Kasson reciprocity arrangements. By all who remember how tedious was the work of securing even the reciprocity treaty with Cuba, where the case was perfectly clear, and the need of prompt action all but universally recognized, the introduction of the Senate in the first stages of a diplomatic agreement would naturally be rejected as altogether too clumsy a method.

It is possible to think that this deliberative assemblage might allow itself to be represented by a permanent standing committee when not in session, but the thought is not encouraging. The French convention of 1792 had its "committee of public safety," which was by no means an unqualified success; and although the British government originates as a committee of the House of Commons, nothing could be more certain than that our Senate would never permit one of its committees to hold toward it the relations that a British administration holds to its creators. While legislative in origin, the British government is executive in essential character, and can therefore form no precedent in this case. Yet, if our Senate really contemplated making instead of obstructing agreements with foreign countries in the interests of peace, some such step as this, the formation of a strong permanent committee to represent it during its sessions and during its recesses would have to be taken. There is no talk of doing such a thing, of course, and this is the most conclusive proof that the function of those ninety statesmen is essentially obstructive, not constructive.

The question whether Senate or Chief Executive is better qualified, personally or by the relation in which they relatively stand to the people, to conduct the foreign relations of the country, is one that need not be considered. The work of fixing the preliminaries of an international arbitration settlement calls at the same time for dexterity, delicacy and promptness, and is work which a legislative assemblage is unfitted by its very constitution to undertake. The request would seem at least reasonable, that with work which it is incapable of doing it should not unnecessarily interfere.

Some Suitable Inscriptions for the Gateways of Forts and Arsenals, and for Battleflags.

SELECTED BY MARY S. ROBINSON.

He maketh wars to cease unto the ends of the earth. — *Psalm xlvi. 9.*

He hath scattered the peoples who delight in war. — *Psalm lxviii. 30.*

In his days shall there be abundance of peace, so long as the moon endureth. — *Psalm lxxii. 7.*

Nation shall not lift up sword against nation; neither shall they learn war any more. — *Isaiah ii. 4.*

The work of righteousness shall be peace: and the effect of righteousness, quietness and assurance forever. *Isaiah xxxii. 17.*

Violence shall no more be committed in the land, nor desolation nor destruction within thy borders. — *Isaiah lx. 18.*

The voice of thy brother's blood crieth unto Me from the ground. — *Genesis iv. 10.*

He shall speak peace unto the nations; and His dominion shall be from sea to sea, and from the river to the ends of the earth. — *Zechariah ix. 10.*

On earth peace, good-will toward men. — *Luke ii. 14.*

Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. — *Matthew xxii. 39.*

The Son of Man came not to destroy, but to save men's lives. — *Luke ix. 56.*

This is my commandment, That ye love one another, as I have loved you. — *John xv. 12.*

He who loveth his neighbor hath fulfilled the law. — *Romans xiii. 8.*

The fruit of the spirit is peace. — *Galatians v. 22.*

Let the peace of God rule in your hearts. — *Colossians iii. 15.*

Whosoever hateth his brother is a murderer: and ye know that no murderer hath eternal life abiding in him. — *I. John iii. 15.*

He who loveth not his brother whom he hath seen, how can he love God whom he hath not seen. This commandment have we from Him: that he who loveth God love his brother also. — *I. John iv. 20, 21.*

"War is the sum of all villainies, the combination of all furies."

The battle hurtles on the plains;
Earth feels new scythes upon her;
We reap our brothers for the wains,
And call the harvest — "honor."

E. B. Browning.

More solvable is this knot
Like almost all the rest, if men were wise,
By gentleness than by war.

— *Tennyson.*

The stormy clangor
Of wild war music o'er the earth shall cease;
Love shall tread out the baleful fire of anger,
And in its ashes plant the tree of peace!

— *Whittier.*

And down the future runs a flood
Of prophesying light,
It shows an earth unstained with blood,
Blossom and fruit where now we see the bud
Of brotherhood and right.

— *J. R. Lowell.*

It comes, or soon or late,
Despite our butcher hordes;
The hour when right shall shatter might,
Ideas shall conquer swords.

— *E. Burritt.*

Books and Pamphlets Received.

JOHN BROWN THE HERO. Personal Reminiscences. By J. W. Winkley, M. D. With an introduction by Frank B. Sanborn. Boston: James H. West Company. 12mo. Cloth, 126 pages.

OUR EDUCATORS — FOR WAR OR PEACE — WHICH? Address delivered at the Peace Convention, Mystic, Conn., 1895. By Ellen Goodell Smith, M. D.

PROPOSED INTERNATIONAL PHONETIC CONFERENCE, TO ADOPT A UNIVERSAL ALPHABET. Containing endorsements of many eminent scholars. Boston University, College of Liberal Arts, 1905.

VERS LA LANGUE INTERNATIONALE. By Leon Bollack. Paris: La Revue, 12 Avenue de l'Opera.

CONSTITUTIONAL METHODS OF MAKING AND RATIFYING TREATIES IN CERTAIN FOREIGN COUNTRIES. Senate Document 158, Fifty-eighth Congress, Third Session.

THE NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL. Extracts from the speech of Hon. James L. Slayden of Texas in the House of Representatives, February 15, 1905.

AUTOBIOGRAPHICAL SKETCHES AND PERSONAL RECOLLECTIONS. By George T. Angell. Boston: The American Humane Education Society, 19 Milk Street. Price, 6 cents; by mail, 10 cents.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE. Brief as to proposed new legislation. Prepared by Samuel Spencer and David Willcox. New York: C. G. Burgoyne, Walker and Centre Streets.

ROMAN CATHOLIC AND PROTESTANT BIBLES COMPARED. The Helen M. Gould Prize Essays. New York: Bible Teachers' Training School, 541 Lexington Ave. Price, paper cover, 50 cents.

LISTE DES ORGANES DU MOUVEMENT PACIFISTE. Corrected to March 1, 1905. Berne, Switzerland: Bureau International de la Paix.

REPORT OF THE SECOND NATIONAL CONGRESS OF THE FRENCH PEACE SOCIETIES, held at Nimes, April 7-10, 1904. Nimes, France: Bureau de l'Association de la Paix par le Droit. In French.

THE SCIENTIFIC INDICTMENT OF WAR. Sermon by James H. Ecob, D. D. Philadelphia: The Unitarian Bookroom, 102 South 12th Street.

AN INAUGURAL ODE. By Alexander Blair Thaw. Nelson, N. H.: The Monadnock Press.

Form of Bequest.

I hereby give and bequeath to the American Peace Society, Boston, a corporation established under the laws of the State of Massachusetts, the sum of ——— dollars, to be employed by the Directors of said Society for the promotion of the cause of peace.

Auxiliaries of the American Peace Society.

THE CHICAGO PEACE SOCIETY,
175 Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
H. W. Thomas, D. D., President.
Mrs. E. A. W. Hoswell, Secretary.

THE MINNESOTA PEACE SOCIETY,
Minneapolis, Minn.
R. J. Mendenhall, President.
Miss A. B. Albertson, Secretary.

THE KANSAS STATE PEACE SOCIETY,
Wichita, Kansas
George W. Hoss, LL. D., President.
J. M. Naylor, Secretary.

NEW YORK GERMAN-AMERICAN PEACE SOCIETY.
New York, N. Y.
Dr. Ernst Richard, President,
5 West 63d Street.
Gustav J. Voss, Secretary, 221 East 87th St.
Henry Feldman, Treasurer, 103 Second Ave.

THE ARBITRATION AND PEACE SOCIETY OF CINCINNATI.
505 First National Bank Building, Cincinnati, Ohio.
Philip V. N. Myers, President,
S. P. Butler, Secretary.

OFFICERS OF THE AMERICAN PEACE SOCIETY.

PRESIDENT.

HON. ROBERT TREAT PAINE, 6 Joy St., Boston, Mass.

TREASURER:

THOMAS H. RUSSELL, 27 State St., Boston, Mass.

CORRESPONDING SECRETARY:

BENJ. F. TRUEBLOOD, LL.D., 31 Beacon St., Boston, Mass.

AUDITOR:

DR. WILLIAM F. JARVIS, 233 Moody St., Waltham, Mass.

VICE-PRESIDENTS:

Rev. Edw. Everett Hale, D.D., 39 Highland St., Roxbury, Mass.
Rev. Lyman Abbott, D.D., Brooklyn, N. Y.
Jane Addams, Hull House, Chicago, Ill.
George T. Angell, 19 Milk Street, Boston, Mass.
Edward Atkinson, Brookline, Mass.
Joshua L. Baily, 1624 Arch St., Philadelphia, Pa.
Rev. Wm. E. Barton, D.D., Oak Park, Ill.
Hon. William I. Buchanan, Buffalo, N. Y.
Rev. Everett D. Burr, D.D., Newton Centre, Mass.
Hezekiah Butterworth, 28 Worcester St., Boston, Mass.
Prof. Geo. N. Boardman, Pittsford, Vt.
Hon. Samuel B. Capen, 38 Greenough Ave., Boston, Mass.
Hon. Jonathan Chace, Providence, R. I.
Rev. Frank G. Clark, Wellesley, Mass.
Edward H. Clement, 3 Regent Circle, Brookline, Mass.
Rev. Joseph S. Cogswell, Walpole, N. H.
Rev. D. S. Coles, Wakefield, Mass.
Geo. Cromwell, Brooklyn, N.Y.
Rev. G. L. Demarest, D.D., Manchester, N. H.
Rev. Howard C. Dunham, Wiathrop, Mass.
Everett O. Fisk, 4 Ashburton Place, Boston, Mass.
B. O. Flower, Brookline, Mass.
Hon. John B. Foster, Bangor, Me.
Philip C. Garrett, Philadelphia, Pa.
Merrill E. Gates, LL.D., Washington, D. C.
Edwin Ginn, 29 Beacon St., Boston, Mass.
Maria Freeman Gray, 3648 22d Street St., San Francisco, Cal.
Hon. Thomas N. Hart, Boston, Mass.
Bishop E. E. Hoss, D. D., Dallas, Tex.
George W. Hoss, LL. D., Wichita, Kansas.
Julia Ward Howe, 241 Beacon St., Boston, Mass.
Hon. John W. Hoyt, Washington, D. C.
Rev. W. G. Hubbard, Cedar Rapids, Ia.
Rev. Charles E. Jefferson, New York City, N. Y.
Augustine Jones, Newton Highlands, Mass.
Hon. Sumner I. Kimball, Washington, D. C.
Bishop William Lawrence, Cambridge, Mass.
Mary A. Livermore, Melrose, Mass.
Edwin D. Mead, 20 Beacon St., Boston, Mass.
Rev. Philip S. Moxom, D.D., Springfield, Mass.
Hon. Nathan Matthews, Jr., 456 Beacon St., Boston, Mass.
George Foster Peabody, 28 Monroe Place, Brooklyn, N. Y.
L. H. Pillsbury, Derry, N. H.
Hon. J. H. Powell, Henderson, Ky.
Hon. Wm. L. Putnam, Portland Me.
Sylvester F. Scovel, D. D., Wooster, Ohio.
Mrs. May Wright Sewall, Indianapolis, Ind.
Edwin Burritt Smith, 164 Dearborn St., Chicago, Ill.
Mrs. Ruth H. Spray, Salida, Col.
Mrs. L. M. N. Stevens, Portland, Me.
Rev. Edward M. Taylor, D.D., Cambridge, Mass.
Pres. M. Carey Thomas, Bryn Mawr, Pa.
Pres. C. F. Thwing, D.D., Cleveland, Ohio.
Pres. James Wallace, Ph. D., St. Paul, Minn.
Bishop Henry W. Warren, Denver, Col.
Herbert Welsh, 1305 Arch St., Philadelphia, Pa.
Rev. A. E. Winship, 29 Beacon St., Boston, Mass.
Richard Wood, 1620 Locust St., Philadelphia, Pa.

DIRECTORS:

Hon. Robert Treat Paine, *ex-officio.*
Benjamin F. Trueblood, LL. D., *ex-officio.*
Rev. Charles G. Ames, D.D., 12 Chestnut St., Boston, Mass
Hannah J. Bailey, Winthrop Centre, Me.
Alice Stone Blackwell, 45 Boutwell St., Dorchester, Mass.
Frederick Brooks, 31 Milk St., Boston, Mass.
Rev. S. C. Bushnell, Arlington, Mass.
Frederic Cunningham, 53 State St., Boston.
Rev. Charles F. Dole, Jamaica Plain, Mass.
Rev. Scott F. Hershey, LL.D., Wooster, Ohio.
Rev. B. F. Leavitt, Melrose Highlands, Mass.
Lucia Ames Mead, 20 Beacon St., Boston, Mass.
Wm. A. Mowry, Ph.D., Hyde Park, Mass.
Henry Pickering, 81 Beacon Street, Boston, Mass.
Frederick A. Smith, West Medford, Mass.
Homer B. Sprague, Ph. D., Newton, Mass.
Rev. G. W. Stearns, Middleboro, Mass.
Rev. Reuen Thomas, D.D., Brookline, Mass.
Fiske Warren, 8 Mt. Vernon Place, Boston, Mass.
Rev. C. H. Watson, D.D., Arlington, Mass.
Kate Gannett Wells, 45 Commonwealth Ave., Boston, Mass.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE:

Hon. Robert Treat Paine, *ex-officio.*
Benjamin F. Trueblood, LL. D., *ex-officio.*
Frederick Brooks, 31 Milk St., Boston, Mass.
Rev. Charles F. Dole, Jamaica Plain, Mass.
Rev. S. F. Hershey, LL. D., Wooster, Ohio.
Wm. A. Mowry, Ph. D., Hyde Park, Mass.
Henry Pickering, 81 Beacon St., Boston, Mass.

HONORARY OUNSEL:

Cephas Brainerd, New York, N.Y.
Moorfield Storey, Brookline, Mass.
Judge William L. Putnam, Portland, Me.
Hon. Josiah Quincy, Boston, Mass.

CONSTITUTION
OF THE
AMERICAN PEACE SOCIETY.

ARTICLE I. This Society shall be designated the "AMERICAN PEACE SOCIETY."

ART. II. This Society, being founded on the principle that all war is contrary to the spirit of the gospel, shall have for its object to illustrate the inconsistency of war with Christianity, to show its baleful influence on all the great interests of mankind, and to devise means for insuring universal and permanent peace.

ART. III. Persons of every Christian denomination desirous of promoting peace on earth and goodwill towards men may become members of this Society.

ART. IV. Every annual subscriber of two dollars shall be a member of this Society.

ART. V. The payment of twenty dollars at one time shall constitute any person a Life-member.

ART. VI. The chairman of each corresponding committee, the officers and delegates of every auxiliary contributing to the funds of this Society and every minister of the gospel who preaches once a year on the subject of peace, and takes up a collection in behalf of the cause, shall be entitled to the privileges of regular members.

ART. VII. All contributors shall be entitled within the year to one-half the amount of their contributions in the publications of the Society.

ART. VIII. The Officers of this Society shall be a President, Vice-Presidents, a Secretary, a Treasurer, an Auditor and a Board of Directors, consisting of not less than twenty members of the Society, including the President, Secretary and Treasurer, who shall be ex-officio members of the Board. All Officers shall hold their offices until their successors are appointed, and the Board of Directors shall have power to fill vacancies in any office of the Society. There shall be an Executive Committee of seven, consisting of the President, Secretary and five Directors to be chosen by the Board, which Committee shall, subject to the Board of Directors, have the entire control of the executive and financial affairs of the Society. Meetings of the Board of Directors or the Executive Committee may be called by the President, the Secretary, or two members of such body. The Society or the Board of Directors may invite persons of well-known legal ability to act as Honorary Counsel.

ART. IX. The Society shall hold an annual meeting at such time and place as the Board of Directors may appoint, to receive their own and the Treasurer's report, to choose officers, and transact such other business as may come before them.

ART. X. The object of this Society shall never be changed; but the Constitution may in other respects be altered, on recommendation of the Executive Committee, or of any ten members of the Society, by a vote of three-fourths of the members present at any regular meeting.

Publications of the American Peace Society.

Tolstoy's Letter on the Russo-Japanese War.—48 pages and cover. Price, postpaid, 10 cts.

A Regular International Advisory Congress. — By Benjamin F. Trueblood, LL.D. A paper read before the Twenty-first Conference of the International Law Association, Antwerp, Belgium, September 30, 1903. Price 5 cts. each,

War Unnecessary and Unchristian.—By AugustineJones, LL. B. New edition, 20 pages. 5 cts. each, $2.00 per hundred.

Nationalism and Internationalism, or Mankind One Body.— By George Dana Boardman, D.D., LL.D. New edition. Price 5 cts. each, or $2.00 per hundred, prepaid.

The Hague Court in the Pious Fund Arbitration. — Address of Hon. William L. Penfield, Solicitor of the State Department, at the Mohonk Arbitration Conference, May 28, 1903. Price 5 cts. each.

The Historic Development of the Peace Idea.— By Benjamin F. Trueblood, LL. D. 32 pages. Price 5 cts. each. $2.50 per hundred.

A Primer of the Peace Movement. — Prepared by Lucia Ames Mead. A reprint of the American Peace Society's Card-display Exhibit at the St. Louis Exposition. A most valuable compendium of statistics, brief arguments, facts, etc. 26 pages, large print. Price, postpaid, 10 cts.; $7.50 per hundred.

A Solemn Review of the Custom of War. — By Noah Worcester, D. D. A reprint of the pamphlet first published in 1814. 24 pages. Price 5 cts.; $3 per hundred.

Dymond's Essay on War. — With an introduction by John Bright. Sent free on receipt of 5 cts. for postage.

War from the Christian Point of View.— By Ernest Howard Crosby. Address at the Episcopal Church Congress at Providence, R. I., November, 1900. 12 pages. $1.50 per hundred, prepaid.

Women and War. — By Grace Isabel Colbron. 4 pages. 40 cts. per hundred, postpaid.

The Nation's Responsibility for Peace.—By Benjamin F. Trueblood, LL.D. Price 5 cts., or $2.00 per hundred, prepaid.

The Mexican International American Conference and Arbitration. — By Hon. William I. Buchanan. Address delivered before the American Peace Society, Boston, April 15, 1902. 23 pages. Price 5 cts., prepaid.

The Absurdities of Militarism.— By Ernest Howard Crosby. 12 pages. Price $1.50 per hundred. Third edition.

An Essay toward the Present and Future Peace of Europe.— By William Penn. First published in 1693. 24 pages, with cover. Price 6 cts., or $3.00 per hundred, prepaid.

International Arbitration at the Opening of the Twentieth Century.—By Benjamin F. Trueblood, LL.D. 20 pages. Price 5 cts. each. $2.50 per hundred, postpaid.

Text of the Hague Convention for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes.— Price 5 cts. each.

Perpetual Peace. — By Immanuel Kant. Translated by Benjamin F. Trueblood. 53 pages. Price 20 cents, postpaid.

The Arbitrations of the United States. — By Professor John Bassett Moore. 32 pages. 5 cents each. $2.50 per hundred.

The War System: Its History, Tendency, and Character, in the Light of Civilization and Religion. — By Rev. Reuen Thomas, D.D. New edition. Price 10 cts., prepaid.

Report of the Chicago Peace Congress of 1893. — Price postpaid, cloth 75 cts.; paper, 50 cents.

Report of the American Friends' Peace Conference. — Held at Philadelphia in December, 1901. Contains all the papers read. Price 15 cts. postpaid.

The Christian Attitude Toward War in the Light of Recent History.— By Alexander Mackennal, D. D. Address delivered at the International Congregational Council, Boston, September 22, 1899. Price $1.50 per hundred, prepaid.

Military Drill in Schools. — By Rev. W. Evans Darby, LL.D. 8 pages. Price 2 cts., or $1.25 per hundred, postpaid.

The Menace of the Navy. — 8 pages. $1.00 per hundred.

William Penn's Holy Experiment in Civil Government. — By Benjamin F. Trueblood, LL.D. 24 pages with cover. 5 cts. each, or $2.00 per hundred, carriage paid.

History of the Seventy-five Years' Work of the American Peace Society. — 16 pages. Two copies for 5 cts.

A Battle, as it appeared to an Eye-witness. — By Rev. R. B. Howard. Letter Leaflet No. 1. Price, postpaid, 20 cts. per hundred.

The Cherry Festival of Naumburg. — Letter Leaflet No. 4. Price 20 cts. per hundred, prepaid.

Washington's Anti-militarism. — Letter Leaflet No. 8. 4 pages. Price 35 cts. per hundred, prepaid.

Coals of Fire. — By Willis R. Hotchkiss, of the Friends' African Industrial Mission. Letter Leaflet No. 7. Price 30 cts. per hundred, prepaid.

The Christ of the Andes. — 8 pages. $1.00 per hundred, postpaid.

The Angel of Peace. ILLUSTRATED.

A FOUR PAGE MONTHLY PAPER FOR CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE.

Devoted to Peace, Temperance, Good Morals, Good Manners.

Thoroughly Christian, but undenominational.
Bright, fresh and attractive, but free from over exciting, sensational reading.
Just the thing for Bible Schools and Mission Work.

Price, 15 Cents a Year for Single Copies. Five Copies to one person, 10 Cents Each. Twenty-five or more Copies to one person, 8 Cents per Copy.

ADDRESS, The Angel of Peace, 31 BEACON STREET, BOSTON.

The Woman's Journal.

The Woman's Journal, edited weekly at 3 Park Street, Boston, Mass., by Henry B. Blackwell and Alice Stone Blackwell, gives the news of the movement for equal rights for women all over the world. $1 per year. Trial subscription, 3 months, 25 cents.

"It is the best source of information concerning what women are doing, what they have done, and what they should do."
—*Julia Ward Howe.*

The Advocate of Peace

A MONTHLY JOURNAL OF THE INTERNATIONAL PEACE MOVEMENT.

Price, One Dollar a Year. In Clubs of ten or more, 50 Cents a Year.

PUBLISHED BY
The American Peace Society,
31 Beacon Street, Boston.

PEACE PUBLICATIONS

FOR SALE BY THE

American Peace Society.

Prices Include Postage.

LAY DOWN YOUR ARMS. By The Baroness von Suttner. Authorized English translation by T. Holmes. New edition, cloth, 65 cts.

SUMNER'S ADDRESSES ON WAR. THE TRUE GRANDEUR OF NATIONS, THE WAR SYSTEM OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF NATIONS, and THE DUEL BETWEEN FRANCE AND GERMANY: The three in one volume. Price, 65 cts., postpaid.

THE PEACE CONFERENCE AT THE HAGUE. By Frederick W. Holls, Secretary of the American Commission to the Hague Conference. 572 pages, octavo. Price, $2.50, postpaid.

CHANNING'S DISCOURSES ON WAR. Containing Dr. Channing's Addresses on War, with extracts from discourses and letters on the subject. Price, 65 cts. postpaid.

ARBITRATION AND THE HAGUE COURT. By Hon. John W. Foster. A concise manual of the chief features of the arbitration movement at the present time. Prepared at the request of the Mohonk Arbitration Conference. Price postpaid, $1.00.

INTERNATIONAL TRIBUNALS: A collection of the Schemes which have been proposed. Adds a long list of instances of international settlements by arbitral courts and commissions. By W. Evans Darby, LL.D. Fourth Edition, much enlarged. Cloth, over 900 pages. Price, $3.50, postpaid.

THE FUTURE OF WAR. By John de Bloch. Preface by W. T. Stead. The sixth volume of Mr. Bloch's great work on "The Future of War," containing all his propositions, summaries of arguments, and conclusions. Price, postpaid, 65 cts.

THE FEDERATION OF THE WORLD. By Benjamin F. Trueblood, LL.D. A discussion of the grounds, both theoretic and historic, for believing in the Realization of the Brotherhood of Humanity, and the final organization of the World into an International State. Second Edition. Cloth, 169 pages. Price, 65 cts.

Official Report

OF THE

Thirteenth Universal Peace Congress

HELD AT

Boston, October 3-8, 1904

A book of 350 pages, paper covers. Contains all the papers, addresses, and discussions of the Congress

A most valuable document for all peace workers and students of the cause

May be procured at the office of the

American Peace Society

31 Beacon Street, Boston

The only charge is 10 cts., to cover postage and wrapping

50 YEARS' EXPERIENCE

PATENTS

TRADE MARKS
DESIGNS
COPYRIGHTS &C.

Anyone sending a sketch and description may quickly ascertain our opinion free whether an invention is probably patentable. Communications strictly confidential. Handbook on Patents sent free. Oldest agency for securing patents.
Patents taken through Munn & Co. rece' e *special notice*, without charge, in the

Scientific American.

A handsomely illustrated weekly. Largest circulation of any scientific journal. Terms, $3 a year; four months, $1. Sold by all newsdealers.

MUNN & Co. 361 Broadway, **New York**
Branch Office, 625 F St., Washington, D. C.